

# Genetics and developmental biology of cooperation

Claudia Kasper<sup>1\*+</sup>, Maddalena Vierbuchen<sup>1\*</sup>, Ulrich Ernst<sup>2§</sup>, Stefan Fischer<sup>3</sup>, Reinder Radersma<sup>4</sup>, Aura Raulo<sup>5</sup>, Filipa Cunha-Saraiva<sup>6</sup>, Min Wu<sup>7</sup>, Kenyon Mobley<sup>8,9#</sup> & Barbara Taborsky<sup>1#</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biology, University of Lund, Sweden

<sup>5</sup>Department of Zoology, University of Oxford

<sup>6</sup>Konrad Lorenz Institute of Ethology, Department of integrative Biology and Evolution, Vetmeduni Vienna, Austria

<sup>7</sup>Department of Environmental Sciences, Evolution & Zoology, University of Basel, Switzerland

<sup>8</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

<sup>9</sup>Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, Germany

\* and # equal contributions

§current address: Research Group of Functional Genomics and Proteomics & Laboratory of Socioecology and Social Evolution, KU Leuven, Belgium

+corresponding author: [claudia.kasper@iee.unibe.ch](mailto:claudia.kasper@iee.unibe.ch)

Keywords: altruism, behaviour, indirect genetic effects, social behaviour, social effects

**Running title: Genetics and development of cooperation**

## Abstract

Despite essential progress towards understanding the evolution of cooperative behaviour, we still lack detailed knowledge about its underlying molecular mechanisms, genetic basis, evolutionary dynamics and ontogeny. An international workshop 'Genetics and Development of Cooperation', organized by the University of Bern (Switzerland), aimed at discussing the current progress in this research field and suggesting avenues for future research. Here, we synthesize the concepts of genetic and non-genetic inheritance of cooperation, and we review a quantitative genetic framework that allows for the inclusion of indirect genetic effects. Furthermore, we argue that including non-genetic inheritance, such as trans-generational epigenetic effects, parental effects, ecological and cultural inheritance, provides a more nuanced view of the evolution of cooperation. We summarize those genes and molecular pathways in a range of species that seem promising candidates for mechanisms underlying cooperative behaviours. Concerning the neurobiological substrate of cooperation, we suggest three cognitive skills necessary for the ability to cooperate, 1) event memory, 2) synchrony with others and 3) responsiveness to others. Taking a closer look at the developmental trajectories that lead to the expression of cooperative behaviours, we discuss the dichotomy between early morphological specialization in social insects and more flexible behavioural specialization in cooperatively breeding vertebrates. Finally, we provide recommendations for which biological systems and species may be particularly suitable, which specific traits and parameters should be measured, what type of approaches should be followed, and which methods should be employed in studies of cooperation in order to better understand how cooperation evolves and manifests in nature.

## Introduction

The question of how cooperation evolves has been a major conceptual puzzle for biologists for centuries. Despite significant inroads in our understanding of the evolution of cooperation over the past 60 years, it remains one of the major challenges in biology to date. While most research into cooperation has been devoted to the functional significance of cooperation, an increasing number of scientists argue that a more holistic approach incorporating functional and mechanistic aspects of phenotypic traits is necessary to provide a complete picture (Soares *et al.*

2010; Weitekamp & Hofmann 2014; Bshary & Oliveira 2015; Taborsky & Taborsky 2015). First, by only focussing on the functional significance, one implicitly assumes that cooperation is not constrained by their underlying physiological, neural, molecular and developmental mechanisms. However, behaviours such as cooperation can only evolve by changes in those underlying mechanisms (Fawcett *et al.* 2013). Second, an integrative approach allows us to address questions of convergent molecular evolution (Aubin-Horth 2015) which is of particular importance for cooperation since it is thought to have evolved multiple times independently (Maynard-Smith & Szathmary 1997). Finally, theoretical and empirical research can be mutually informative. Detailed knowledge of the mechanisms underlying cooperation and evolutionary constraints on cooperative traits could lead to the development of models that better reflect the actual environmental complexity (McNamara & Houston 2009; Soares *et al.* 2010).

Our goal in the workshop 'Genetics and Development of Cooperation' organized by the University of Bern, held in Bern, Switzerland in February of 2016, was to explore new horizons in the fields of genetics and developmental mechanisms of cooperation. A list of the guest speakers and the titles of talks, as well as the names of the workshop participants, is provided in the supporting information. In the workshop, we focused on cooperative strategies such as reciprocity, mutualism, and coercion between family groups and non-kin for feeding, protection and raising young. We also discussed cooperative parental care, parent-offspring and sibling conflict, and communal nesting. Plenary talks were used as a launching pad for discussion sessions and poster sessions showcased individual participants' research. In the following sections we relate the content and questions raised by the workshop sessions. Moreover, we provide an outlook and further avenues for research in an effort to synthesize the various key points raised by the workshop.

### **Modes of inheritance of cooperation**

Defining cooperation is notoriously difficult because of the complex interplay of fitness costs and benefits that accrue over different time periods and the varieties of situations under which it occurs (Sachs *et al.* 2004). For the purpose of the workshop, we followed the definition given in

Taborsky & Taborsky (2015) stating that "cooperation refers to the simultaneous or consecutive acting together of two or more individuals by same or different behaviours". Cooperative acts are typically costly for the individuals involved, but their net result is a fitness benefit. Cooperation can evolve if it yields immediate or delayed fitness benefits for all partners. Alternatively, if one partner can coerce the other into cooperation, only the receiver gains fitness benefits. Cooperative acts that yield direct fitness benefits for all partners are, for instance, improved prey capture when hunting in small groups in wolves (MacNulty *et al.* 2012), lowered predation risk through flocking behaviour in birds (Beauchamp 2003), reduced heat loss in huddling penguins (Ancel *et al.* 1997) and increased energetic benefit during V-formation flight in migrating birds (Voelkl *et al.* 2015; Voelkl & Fritz 2017). Altruistic behaviours, however, impose costs on actors without yielding direct benefits and result in a net decrease of the actor's direct fitness while increasing the recipient's fitness (Lehmann & Keller 2006). Examples of altruism include sterile castes of social insects that raise a queen's offspring (reviewed in (Ratnieks & Wenseleers 2008), but also the willingness to share food, engage in collective warfare, or to bear costs to punish non-cooperators in encounters with unrelated and even unknown individuals in humans (Fehr & Fischbacher 2003).

An explanation of how such costly altruistic behaviours may evolve is predicated in the theoretical work by Hamilton who suggested that altruistic genes evolve under the scenario of inclusive fitness (Hamilton 1964a; b). In his seminal paper (Hamilton 1964b), he stipulates under which conditions altruism should evolve by deriving the famous Hamilton's rule,  $rB > C$ . Under this scenario, costs to the focal individual (C) are outweighed by the benefits to the receiver (B), weighted by the genetic relatedness (r) between the two individuals. If the costs and benefits are similar, cooperation should arise based on genetic relatedness, which is also known as kin selection. Despite this illuminating theoretical foundation, definite evidence for specific drivers for the evolution of cooperation remains difficult to identify for many species that display cooperative behaviours. For example, the evidence for kin selection as a driver of cooperation is mixed (Riehl 2013; Taborsky *et al.* 2016) and costs and benefits can be difficult to assess and compare objectively within and between species (Hatchwell & Komdeur 2000; Sachs *et al.* 2004).

Knowledge of the genetic, molecular and physiological mechanisms that underlie cooperative behaviours can greatly improve our understanding of the evolution of cooperation. For instance, genetic variation in cooperative behaviours reflects their evolutionary potential, i.e. how those traits can respond to natural selection. Evolutionary theory predicts that cooperative behaviour, like other phenotypic traits, should have a heritable basis if they are the product of adaptive evolution (Tinbergen 1963; Komdeur 2006; Hofmann *et al.* 2014). In fact, there is some empirical support for heritable differences in cooperative behaviours (e.g. in western bluebirds *Sialia mexicana* (Charmantier *et al.* 2007), and in humans (Cesarini *et al.* 2008). However, an individual's cooperative tendency is likely to be influenced additionally by social and non-social environmental conditions to allow for plasticity during development or to fine-tune payoffs in its current situation (Fischer *et al.*, *in revision*; Kasper *et al.*, *in revision*; Koenig *et al.* 1992; Stiver *et al.* 2004; Sanderson *et al.* 2015b). Moreover, non-genetic inheritance of cooperation through social interactions and cultural transmission may add additional layers to the complexity of the evolution of cooperation (Uller & Helanterä; Avital & Jablonka 2000; Danchin *et al.* 2011), but this field is thus far underdeveloped for cooperation.

#### *Genetic inheritance and indirect genetic effects*

For a cooperative – or any other – trait to be subject to selection, it needs to vary among individuals. This variation should result in differential fitness and should be heritable (Lewontin 1970). Quantitative genetic models allow researchers to explore the extent to which genetic variation influences phenotypic variation by estimating the proportional contributions of heritable genetic variation and environmental variation to the total phenotypic variation. By combining these estimates with estimates of the fitness consequences of this variation, we can predict how a trait will respond to selection (Lande & Arnold 1983).

Accounting for the social environment of individuals adds a further dimension to cooperative behaviour because it involves interactions with other individuals, making the behaviour of an individual contingent upon the behaviour and genotype of its social partners. Therefore, the cooperative phenotypes should be considered as being partly influenced by interactions with

social partners and the genes they carry: i.e., their 'interacting phenotype' (Moore *et al.* 1997). This influence of the social environment sets those traits apart from traits that are solely influenced by heritable genetic and non-social environmental components, and therefore requires additional theoretical considerations (Bleakley *et al.* 2010). Especially for cooperative traits, we can expect that the genotypes of interaction partners affect the fitness of an individual in a similar way as the individual's own genes (McGlothlin *et al.* 2014). For instance, in species that provide biparental care, parents can negotiate the amount of care each provides which equally affects both parents' fitness in terms of offspring survival (McNamara & Houston 2005). Another example where social environment may play a key role is cooperative breeding, where helpers might adjust their helping effort based on the contributions of other group members (Adams *et al.* 2015). Parents can reduce their level of care when helpers are present (Taborsky *et al.* 2007; Johnstone 2011), or where subordinates are coerced into helping (Clutton-Brock & Parker 1995; Fischer *et al.* 2014).

In his talk, 'A social effects perspective on kin selection', Jason Wolf outlined the quantitative genetic version of Hamilton's rule that takes into account the impact of the focal individual's own phenotype on its fitness ('non-social selection gradient',  $\beta_N$ ), but also the phenotype of the individual with whom it interacts ('social selection gradient',  $\beta_S$ , Fig. 1, (McGlothlin *et al.* 2014). This model demonstrates that selection will favour altruism when the benefits ( $\beta_S$ ), weighted by the phenotypic similarity of the partners, are greater than the costs ( $-\beta_N$ ). In cases where phenotypic similarity solely arises due to genetic relatedness, it is equivalent to Hamilton's relatedness term (Queller 1992; McGlothlin *et al.* 2014). However, genetically unrelated individuals can be phenotypically similar. Covariances between the partners can arise due to the influence of genes expressed in another individual, providing an 'alternative pathway from genotype to fitness' via indirect genetic effects (IGEs, McGlothlin *et al.* 2014). Unlike a direct genetic effect (DGE) where an individual's genotype directly affects its phenotype, IGEs are the expression of one individual's genotype influencing the expression of another individual's phenotype. Thus, IGEs need to be scaled by a parameter that reflects the genetic influence of an interaction on the trait expressed in the focal individual. Here, the interaction effect coefficient

( $\psi$ ) illustrates this relationship and ranges from -1 to 1 (Fig. 1). In the absence of genetic relatedness, cooperation should only evolve if benefits scaled by the interaction effect coefficient ( $\psi\beta_S$ ) outweigh costs ( $-\beta_N$ ). This framework provides an extension of the quantitative genetics approach to Hamilton's rule to interactions between unrelated individuals. Mutually beneficial behaviours can evolve even in the absence of relatedness between the interaction partners, because both partners gain direct net fitness benefits immediately or with some delay, and hence no conflict of interest occurs (Lehmann & Keller 2006). Many examples of cooperation in birds (Riehl 2013), fish (Wong & Balshine 2011), vampire bats (Wilkinson *et al.* 2016), humans (Jaeggi & Gurven 2013) and insects (Field & Leadbeater 2016; Gadagkar 2016) demonstrate that interaction partners are indeed often unrelated. Therefore, kin selection may not be the primary evolutionary force driving cooperation in these systems (Taborsky *et al.* 2016), and alternative hypotheses focusing on the IGEs should be considered.

#### *Non-genetic inheritance*

Heritability is not limited to the transference of genetic information from parent to offspring. Non-genetic information can potentially contribute to the evolution of a cooperative trait if it is transmitted from one generation to the next (Uller & Helanterä, in press). Distinguishing between different forms of heritability is crucial, because the form of transmission determines who inherits from whom and also how reliable the transmitted information is. In his talk 'Nongenetic inheritance, maternal effects, epigenetics, and cultural transmission: where are we now?', Etienne Danchin discussed the concept of inclusive inheritance, which allows not only for the transference of information via genes, but also through mechanisms of non-genetic inheritance (Danchin *et al.* 2014). Non-genetic inheritance is defined as the transmission of factors other than the DNA sequence from ancestors to offspring that affect the offspring's phenotype (Bonduriansky & Day 2009). Some of these mechanisms include heritable epigenetic effects, parental effects, ecological (or habitat) inheritance, and cultural (or social) inheritance (Danchin *et al.* 2011).

Narrow sense epigenetic inheritance occurs when phenotypic variation arises from heritable changes in gene expression, rather than differences in the DNA sequence itself. This variation can occur as a result of structural changes to the genome. For example, the modification of histone proteins or the methylation of cytosine bases in DNA can upregulate, downregulate, or silence gene expression (Jenuwein & Allis 2001; Suzuki & Bird 2008; Lee *et al.* 2010). These epigenetic modifications can be inherited from one generation to the next (Jablonka & Raz 2009; Danchin *et al.* 2011). For example, mice that are conditioned to fear an odour for its associated negative stimulus pass on the fear of this odour to their descendants. Hypomethylation of an odour receptor gene (*Olfr151*) is transferred via the gametes, resulting in naïve mice having an innate fear of the odour (Dias & Ressler 2014). If and how epigenetic inheritance influences cooperative traits and learned social behaviours warrants further investigation.

Parental effects—effects that parents have on the phenotype of their offspring, but not via the inherited genome—can also act as mechanisms for non-genetic inheritance (Mousseau & Fox 1998). The relevance of parental effects is now widely accepted and considered an additional source of heritability that contributes to parent-offspring resemblance with important evolutionary implications. Parental effects can be genetic, when parental genetic variation is the cause of the environmental component affecting offspring development (Danchin *et al.* 2011). However, parental effects can also be non-genetic (Danchin *et al.* 2011). For instance, helping tendencies in cooperative breeders have been shown to be influenced by maternal identity (Kasper *et al.*, *in revision*). To date, the exact mechanism of transmission is unclear, but candidate mechanisms are maternal allocation of resources towards egg size or composition (Russell *et al.* 2007; Taborsky *et al.* 2007; Robinson *et al.* 2008), or parental care quality (Fischer *et al.*, *in revision*; Goodson *et al.* 2005), which may have subsequent bearing on offspring phenotypes. Parental effects can be accounted for in quantitative genetics models by including them as IGEs (see 'Genetic inheritance of cooperation').

Individuals may modify their environments through a process known as 'niche construction' that might alter the selective forces they experience (Laland *et al.* 2016). These modified



environments can be passed down to offspring through ecological inheritance, which contributes to inclusive heritability (Danchin *et al.* 2011). For example, termite mounds are cooperative efforts to modify temperature and humidity and are inherited both within and across generations (Odling-Smee *et al.* 2003). Within the quantitative genetic framework we developed earlier this means that phenotypes of others (the 'partners' in Fig. 1) modify the environment, which changes the selection gradients affecting the fitness of the focal individual ( $\beta_N$  and possibly  $\beta_S$  in Fig. 1) and these environments can be inherited.

Finally, cooperative behaviours can also be transmitted via cultural inheritance (Avital & Jablonka 2000; Danchin *et al.* 2011). For cultural information to be conveyed, a trait must be (i) socially learned, (ii) transmitted across generations or from older to younger individuals, (iii) expressed sufficiently long to be picked-up by younger individuals and (iv) individuals must be able to generalize the social information to use it in new contexts (Danchin & Wagner 2010). For example, in cooperatively breeding long-tailed tits *Aegithalos caudatus*, individuals preferentially help at the nests of related birds. Kin recognition and inclination to help are determined through the similarity of vocalizations, which are learned in early development (Hatchwell *et al.* 2001; Sharp *et al.* 2005). If kin recognition operates only via those vocalizations and individuals are able to recognize kin they have never encountered before based on their dialect, kin recognition depends on culturally inherited differences in song.

An important consideration for all non-genetic inheritance mechanisms is their significance relative to genetic inheritance mechanisms. The contributions of non-genetic inheritance are likely to be highly variable depending on the trait and species in question, and their effect on the pace, and direction of evolution and maintenance of traits can be highly significant (Kirkpatrick & Lande 1989). For instance, non-genetic inheritance could explain the missing heritability — a lack of genetic markers explaining parent-offspring resemblance — in certain traits. Non-genetic inheritance could also play a role in the spread of novel alleles, maladaptive behaviours, and major organisational transitions (Danchin *et al.* 2011). An interesting way to investigate the relative importance of non-genetic inheritance is by incorporating it in quantitative genetic

models through the introduction of a double pedigree: one for genetic and one for non-genetic correlations (Helanterä & Uller 2010; Day & Bonduriansky 2011).

Prior to any empirical efforts, it is vital to consider under which conditions non-genetic inheritance is expected to be adaptive. In a group discussion on “Non-genetic inheritance and the evolution of social/cooperative traits” led by Reinder Radersma, we explored such conditions for adaptive non-genetic inheritance. First, the transference of information across generations is beneficial in cases where the environment varies in a repeatable and predictable way over time. Generation time should be shorter than the period of environmental change, leading to a correlation between the parental phenotype and the environment the offspring will encounter. Second, changes in the environment should happen at a rate faster than the genome is able to accommodate (English *et al.* 2015b; Leimar & McNamara 2015; Fig 2). Third, within-generation phenotypic plasticity should be too costly, or individuals are physically, developmentally, or behaviourally constrained to adequately respond to the changing environment (Uller 2008). Finally, the benefits of non-genetic inheritance of a trait must outweigh the costs of the inheritance mechanism (Uller 2008). The reliability and quality of the information offspring or parents are able to gather about the environment is a critical component of the costs and greatly affects the adaptiveness of different inheritance mechanisms (Leimar & McNamara 2015). Further theoretical development, in tandem with empirical studies, should help to elucidate and quantify non-genetic inheritance of cooperative traits and behaviours in the future.

#### *Relevance of IGEs and non-genetic inheritance to understanding the evolution of cooperation*

The IGE framework has the potential to improve our understanding of the evolution of cooperation by modelling how social interactions with conspecifics shape the fitness of cooperating individuals. Specifically, IGEs can be thought of as epistatic interactions between the focal trait and genes expressed in conspecifics and are thus part of the genetic architecture of a trait (Meffert *et al.* 2002). By providing the possibility of more realistic models of the non-additive selective pressures posed by the social environment on cooperative traits, different conclusions about the rate and even the direction of evolution might be drawn than from frameworks that

do not explicitly model IGEs. For instance, for social interactions that involve feedback loops between the same or different traits expressed in interacting individuals, the rate of evolution is expected to be 5 to 9 times faster than in the absence of IGEs, given that  $\psi$  is rather high (Fig. 1B and C, Moore *et al.* 1997). Furthermore, by changing the resemblance of relatives, the presence of IGEs could mask or exaggerate heritable genetic variance (Bijma & Wade 2008).

The inclusive inheritance framework provides a more nuanced view of the evolution of cooperation by treating inheritance as a multidimensional phenomenon. For instance, failing to incorporate cultural inheritance into models of evolution of human behaviour is demonstrated to lead to substantive discrepancies between predicted and observed evolutionary outcomes (Richerson & Boyd 1978). Moreover, the phenotype with maximum fitness can differ depending on the mode of inheritance—for example between genetic and cultural inheritance—and thus conflict between these systems can arise. This means that maladaptive behaviours like costly acts of altruism towards unrelated individuals could spread in a population in cases where variance in cultural transmission is higher than variance in genetic transmission. Consequently, positive cultural selection could override negative selection in the genetic domain (Aguilar & Akçay 2016).

### **Genetic and molecular pathways underlying cooperation**

A cursory review of genetic mechanisms in various systems demonstrates that there are numerous molecular pathways leading to the evolution of cooperative traits (Table S1 in the supporting information). Although a variety of molecular mechanisms have been identified, the overwhelming majority of studies indicate that hormonal regulatory pathways seem to hold the key to the evolution of cooperation in many of the examples found in social insects and vertebrates (Table S1).

The changes in how reproductive hormonal signalling systems work can have significant consequences for the emergence of helping behaviour which is often associated with suppressed reproduction. The insulin signalling – juvenile hormone (JH) – vitellogenin (Vg) regulatory pathway is a fundamental component involved in the evolution of cooperation in insects. Here

both JH and Vg are related to reproduction with JH being a gonadotropin and Vg being a yolk protein (Corona *et al.* 2007). In many insect species, JH and Vg are synergistically regulated (Handler & Postlethwait 1978; Comas *et al.* 1999; Sheng *et al.* 2011). In contrast, the regulation of JH and Vg in eusocial honeybees, *Apis mellifera*, is antagonistic (Corona *et al.* 2007) and regulates caste differentiation and division of labour in honeybees. The same regulatory pattern in the JH-Vg pathway was recently discovered in two sub-social species, the European earwig *Forficula auricularia* and the burying beetle *Nicrophorus vespilloides* (Engel *et al.* 2016, Wu *et al.*, unpublished). These findings suggest that this pathway may be co-opted in post-hatching parental care behaviours and in social evolution (Corona *et al.* 2007).

In vertebrates, oxytocin (OXT), vasopressin (AVP), their non-mammalian homologs mesotocin, isotocin (IT) and vasotocin, and dopamine and serotonin are key endocrine players in cooperative behaviour (Soares *et al.* 2010; Ebstein *et al.* 2010; Madden & Clutton-Brock 2011; Anacker & Beery 2013). These hormones affect social affiliation (Reddon *et al.* 2015), social recognition and approach (Thompson & Walton 2004), reward estimates (Messias *et al.* 2016a), social learning (Messias *et al.* 2016b; Soares *et al.* 2016) and pair bonding (Insel & Shapiro 1992). For example, in humans, OXT is suggested to favour trust and parochial cooperation (De Dreu 2012), whereas AVP increased cooperative tendencies in reciprocal interactions (Rilling *et al.* 2012). Cooperation can also be enhanced or decreased by social stress and its underlying hormones (glucocorticoids, GCs). For example, in many social species, reproductive suppression of subordinate individuals is regulated by behaviours of dominant individuals that elicit higher levels of GCs in subordinates (Creel *et al.* 1996; Sanderson *et al.* 2015a).

The neuroendocrine pathways regulated by hormones appear critical for the evolution of cooperative behaviours in vertebrates (Goodson 2005, 2013; Donaldson & Young 2008; Soares *et al.* 2010; O'Connell & Hofmann 2011a; c), but the strength and direction of their regulatory effects depend on species, social context, and sex. A recent comparison of brain gene expression of IT and AVT and their receptors between different social and non-social species pairs of cichlids revealed contrasting patterns (O'Connor *et al.* 2015). Furthermore, experimentally increased OXT

(or its homolog IT) increased helping behaviours and decreased aggression in cooperatively breeding meerkats, *Suricata suricatta* (Madden & Clutton-Brock 2011), and the sensitivity to social information in *N. pulcher* (Reddon *et al.* 2012), but it decreased sociability in this species (Reddon *et al.* 2014). However, the direction of the effect of IT treatment depended on the pre-treatment sociability in gold fish (Thompson & Walton 2004), and OXT had no effect in house mice, *Mus musculus domesticus* (Harrison *et al.* 2016). In humans, experimentally administered OXT increased cooperation within groups, but also enhanced competition between groups (De Dreu 2012). Interestingly, these effects of OXT on social behaviour in humans have been demonstrated to differ between women and men (Gao *et al.* 2016).

The evolution of sociality from solitary ancestry and the evolution of cooperative from non-cooperative behaviours requires the emergence of novel social traits (Taborsky & Taborsky 2015). Genes present in solitary species could be co-opted towards social evolution. For example, *Vg* encodes the precursor of yolk protein (Corona *et al.* 2007); in sub-social European earwigs and burying beetles its expression is associated with parental care (Roy-Zokan *et al.* 2015; Wu *et al.* unpublished); in eusocial honey bee it regulates division of labour and caste differentiation (Amdam *et al.* 2003, 2004). Another example is the *PebIII* gene which had a direct genetic effect on the metamorphosis of the solitary insect *Drosophila melanogaster* (Sabatier *et al.* 2003). In the sub-social European earwigs, this gene is co-regulated and co-adapted between parent and offspring. RNAi knock-down of this gene showed an indirect genetic effect on offspring development and a direct genetic effect on maternal future reproduction in the earwigs (Wu *et al.*, unpublished). Potential neo-functionalization or sub-functionalization of this gene was found in the eusocial termite *Reticulitermes flavipes*, with differential expression of two transcripts of *PebIII* between reproductive castes (Steller *et al.* 2010).

### **Neurobiological mechanisms of cooperation**

Group-living animals often cooperate, as well as compete, with the same individuals multiple times over their lifespan. To assess the costs and benefits of social interactions, individuals need to continuously process social stimuli and keep track of past interactions. Responding to the

multitude of daily social challenges encountered by social species requires behavioural flexibility and social competence (sensu Taborsky & Oliveira 2012; Bshary & Oliveira 2015). These complex social decisions require highly developed neuronal networks, which integrate many brain areas and populations of neurons (Platt *et al.* 2016). For example, group size and the corresponding availability of social partners predict structural changes of the thickness of grey matter in multiple brain regions (Sallet *et al.* 2011). Group size also leads to functional change in terms of different co-activation of two brain regions, the superior temporal sulcus and the rostral prefrontal cortex (Sallet *et al.* 2011). To understand how individuals make flexible social decisions while engaged in cooperative or competitive interactions, researchers often focused on species with more complex cognitive abilities such as humans or primates. However, recent work has highlighted that many physiological and neurological mechanisms are conserved across taxonomic groups (O'Connell & Hofmann 2011c). Further, seemingly cognitively demanding abilities, such as individual recognition or keeping track of past interactions, might be the result of learning processes involving operant-conditioning rather than sophisticated cognitive mechanisms (Bshary *et al.* 2016). Hormones and ontogeny can also affect the cognitive skills necessary for the ability to cooperate. We suggest these consist of three aspects: 1) event memory, 2) synchrony with others and 3) responsiveness to others. For example, zebra finches were prevented from cooperating in a prisoner's dilemma task when their stress hormone levels were experimentally raised. These hormones reduce memory capacity required for reciprocity and remove incentive for cooperation (Larose & Dubois 2011). In addition, humans and many animals cooperate better when more receptive to social stimuli through synchronization in terms of personality, experience, or hormonal physiology. For example, shared excitement synchronizes brain activity in humans to enable better cooperation in times of need (Nummenmaa *et al.* 2012).

It is now well established that two evolutionarily conserved neural circuits are fundamental in regulating social decision-making in vertebrates and are commonly referred to as the Social Decision Making Network (SDMN) (O'Connell & Hofmann 2011b). The SDMN is comprised of two neural circuits: the mesolimbic reward system, which evaluates the salience of external stimuli to generate an adaptive response, and the social behaviour network, which evaluates external

stimuli (Goodson 2005). Only the interconnected activity of both systems enables animals to regulate and implement adaptive behavioural outputs in response to environmental challenges and opportunities. Many hormones that influence key aspects of cooperative behaviour, such as OXT, AVP, dopamine or serotonin, are part of the SDMN. However, even though the SDMN is doubtless an important player in social behaviour, it remains an open question whether cooperative behaviour itself is regulated by the SDMN.

#### **Developmental regulation of sociality/cooperative behaviour**

Modes of development can have a huge impact on the evolution of early phenotypic specialization versus extended phenotypic plasticity (English *et al.* 2015a). Invertebrates, and in particular eusocial insects, are more prone to early developmental specialization because they have to commit to the development of a certain phenotype before metamorphosis (Wilson 1971). Most social insects show a strict behavioural and morphological caste differentiation determined by different developmental trajectories, which leads to a division of labour in insect colonies (Wilson 1971). Arguably, the most famous example is the development of queens in honeybees induced by the ingestion of royal jelly (Kaftanoglu *et al.* 2011). Early caste determination is a common phenomenon in most eusocial insects where nutrition and inhibitory pheromones play an important role (Schwander *et al.* 2010). There are, however, a number of social insect species that are cooperative breeders without morphological specializations, which can switch between the role of subordinates and dominants within a lifetime (Field & Leadbeater 2016; Gadagkar 2016).

In contrast to many social insects, most social vertebrates remain morphologically and behaviourally flexible throughout their life. For example, dominant breeders and subordinate group members in cooperatively breeding vertebrates maintain their full reproductive capacity (Bruitjes *et al.* 2011; Bell *et al.* 2012), but can adapt their social roles and behaviours contingent on the social context and environmental conditions (Bruitjes & Taborsky 2011). Therefore, most social vertebrates do not develop morphological specialisations based on their social rank or role (Carter *et al.* 2014; Huchard *et al.* 2014; Sanderson *et al.* 2015b; Taborsky *et al.* 2015; Zöttl *et al.*

2016, but see Jarvis 1981; Fischer *et al.* 2015). Nevertheless, early behavioural specialization might be beneficial, for instance, when deciding if and when to disperse (Fischer *et al.*, *in revision*; Zöttl *et al.* 2013), if and when to challenge the dominant individual in the home territory (Sharp & Clutton-Brock 2011), and whether to rear offspring communally or solitarily (Jo Manning *et al.* 1995). All of these decisions require specific behavioural repertoires. Bolder, more risk-prone phenotypes are more successful dispersers (Chapman *et al.* 2011) while larger individuals with superior fighting abilities are better able to challenge dominants for territory take-overs (Huchard *et al.* 2016). A communal nest requires individuals to express prosocial behaviours towards breeding partners and foreign young (Weidt *et al.* 2008, 2014; Dugdale *et al.* 2010). Social behaviour can be costly (Grantner & Taborsky 1998; Cram *et al.* 2015) and misdirected behaviours may have high fitness costs and can lead to evictions from the group (Bell *et al.* 2012), infanticide (Schmidt *et al.* 2015) and even to fatal conflicts (Enquist & Leimar 1990). Thus, environmentally induced developmental programming of behavioural strategies, e.g. via parental effects or own early experience, might be also important in cooperatively breeding vertebrates.

The cues responsible for early phenotypic specialization are diverse and can induce phenotypic specializations between and within social groups. For example, intragroup caste specialization is dependent on group size (Ferguson-Gow *et al.* 2014) or the level of competition between nests (Passera *et al.* 1996) in ant species. In cooperatively breeding vertebrates, group size can influence maternal investment in eggs. Smaller eggs are produced when more helpers are available to compensate for the reduced maternal investment in individual eggs (Russell *et al.* 2007; Taborsky *et al.* 2007). In turn, offspring developing in larger groups may express different behavioural phenotypes than offspring from small groups as a result of developmental plasticity (Fischer *et al.* 2015). Within-group factors such as the provision of more or better food to particular group members can lead to divergent behavioural phenotypes such as the development of different caste phenotypes in social insect societies (Schwander *et al.* 2010) or different degrees of competitiveness in some vertebrates (Buston 2003; Heg *et al.* 2004a; Huchard *et al.* 2016).



458

459 A second important role of developmental plasticity for social organisation is the regulation of  
460 conflict within groups. The level of conflict in cooperative societies is particularly high when  
461 subordinates are fertile and therefore have a vested interest their own breeding opportunities.  
462 Subordinates queuing for a dominant position may compete with other subordinate group  
463 members about the position in the social hierarchy (Huchard *et al.* 2016). If access to  
464 reproductive opportunities is strongly skewed towards a few dominant individuals, conflicts over  
465 reproduction can also arise between dominant breeders and maturing subordinates (Heg *et al.*  
466 2004b). As social rank is often size-dependent, developmental plasticity of growth strategies may  
467 play a key role in either reducing or enhancing conflict. In response to social cues obtained from  
468 other group members, growth may be strategically enhanced to outcompete rivals or reduced to  
469 lower potential conflict with dominant group members. In her talk 'Measuring cooperation and  
470 associated phenotypes in the field: developmental trajectories and genetic basis', Elise Huchard  
471 showed that in cooperatively breeding meerkats, growth rates remain flexible throughout the  
472 entire ontogeny (Huchard *et al.* 2014). In this species, rank position depends on size and age, and  
473 subordinate females queue for the position of the dominant female, which is usually the oldest  
474 and heaviest female of the group. When Huchard and colleagues (Huchard *et al.* 2016)  
475 experimentally increased the growth rate of a subordinate by supplemental feeding, same-sex  
476 rivals responded by accelerating their own growth and food uptake. Conversely, subordinates of  
477 the cooperatively breeding cichlid fish, *N. pulcher*, inhibit their growth if their size difference to  
478 the same-sex dominant breeder becomes too small, as subordinates reaching body sizes too  
479 close to that of dominants risk expulsion from the group (Heg *et al.* 2004b).

480

481 Finally, developmental processes may mediate conflict between dominant breeders and their  
482 offspring and future helpers or workers. In cooperative societies, not only are offspring  
483 dependent on care, but become carers themselves later in ontogeny. The optimal contribution  
484 to alloparental care required by dominant breeders versus the optimal contribution subordinate  
485 helpers are willing to give may diverge and depend on the options for dispersal and independent  
486 breeding by subordinates (Russell & Lummaa 2009). For instance, in his talk 'Hormonal signals,

epigenetic regulation, maternal effects, and their consequences for cooperation and conflict', Nikolaus von Engelhardt suggested that breeding females endow eggs with hormones or RNA transcripts, which might influence growth and behavioural propensities of offspring in a way that optimizes maternal fitness. These maternal effects may then influence the offspring's future willingness to contribute to alloparental care of younger broods. At the prenatal stage offspring depend on parental cues to adjust their development, since they do not directly experience their environment. However, offspring may use cues obtained postnatally to "disagree" with the maternal program and reverse their behavioural tendencies (Fischer *et al.* 2015).

Because of the important role of developmental plasticity for the regulation of cooperative behaviours it is conceivable that in the course of the evolution of cooperation, environmentally induced phenotypic plasticity precedes, or even facilitates, genetic adaptation known as the 'plasticity-first hypothesis' (West-Eberhard 2003; see Levis & Pfennig 2016 for a review). In a first step plasticity enables a rapid adaptive response to changing environments through phenotypic accommodation. In a second step, genetic accommodation allows for the relatively slow refinement of genotypes by accumulating beneficial genetic mutations. This, together with the co-option of genes as discussed in previous sections, could provide an answer to the longstanding question how novel cooperative traits emerge when cooperative species evolve from non-cooperative ancestors. Since the underlying genetic architecture of cooperative behaviour is arguably complex and polygenic, genetic adaptation alone is unlikely to account for these relatively fast transitions. Thus, phenotypic plasticity that precedes genetic adaptation as described above might offer another explanation for the fast emergence of cooperative traits.

## Outlook

In previous sections we discussed ways in which cooperative behaviour can be transmitted from one generation to the next, either genetically, through heritable epigenetic changes, or through social learning and culture. We also outlined reasons why the evolutionary dynamics of cooperative traits might be less straightforward than generally assumed. Following Anna

Lindholm's talk and the ensuing discussion, here we focus on practical considerations and we provide promising avenues for future research in the genetics and development of cooperation.

**Which systems are suitable?** The suitability of a system will ultimately depend on the exact question under investigation. In general, information on individuals is required for quantitative genetic approaches and desirable for molecular genetic approaches. Some taxa show a naturally occurring array of closely related species with a range of cooperative social behaviours. For example, Hymenoptera display a wide cooperative continuum from solitary to subsocial to eusocial species (Wilson 1971), and species of the teleost family Cichlidae represent a wide range of social systems from non-social to highly social (Taborsky 1994; Heg & Bachar 2006). The parasitoid bethylid wasps presented by Ian Hardy at the workshop provides an excellent example of a tractable social study system. In one of these species, *Sclerodermus harmandi*, multiple unrelated foundresses cooperatively rear each other's offspring on a single host resource (Kapranas *et al.* 2016). There is a broad scope for experimental manipulation of resource size, relatedness, foundress number, and offspring survival in bethylid wasps (e.g. Sreenivas & Hardy 2016). The quasisocial nature of this species makes it a particularly suitable candidate for the study of cooperative behaviours in insects at the threshold of the evolution of complex sociality.

Comparisons between the genomes and transcriptomes of species along the continuum of sociality can indicate likely genes and pathways for further investigation (Robinson *et al.* 2005; Rehan & Toth 2015; Kapheim 2016; Trapp *et al.* 2016; Toth & Rehan 2017). Comparisons within species are also useful to examine possible molecular causes of phenotypic variance. Systems in which individuals differ in their tendency to cooperate or cheat in social situations (Santorelli *et al.* 2008), or in the amount of alloparental care to provide (Fischer *et al.*, *in revision*; Kasper *et al.*, *in revision*), are particularly well suited to studies of the underlying genetic architecture or gene expression patterns at the basis of cooperative phenotypes. Furthermore, the evolution of cooperative behaviours might not only depend on interactions within, but also between species (West *et al.* 2007) or between different organizational levels of sociality (West & Gardner 2013). We provide an example for multilevel cooperation, namely between microbiota and their host,

in the supporting information.

**Which specific traits and parameters should be measured?** It is of paramount importance to understand the biology of a system well enough in order to be able to accurately quantify fitness, and to decide which traits to measure. It is especially important to carefully consider if the phenotype measured is indeed a target of selection. In some instances, it might be better to measure the underlying mechanism, for instance an individual's physiology or cognitive ability, instead of the behavioural phenotype (behavioural gambit, Fawcett *et al.* 2013). Moreover, the interaction coefficient  $\psi$  could itself be considered a trait that varies genetically between individuals and is thus subject to selection (Bleakley & Brodie IV 2009) and of particular importance for the evolution of cooperative traits. For instance,  $\psi$  can be estimated empirically as the partial regression coefficient of a phenotype on its partner's phenotype while keeping the direct genetic influence constant. However, this requires isogenic lines or large-scale breeding designs with repeated measures of the same genotype with different social partners. Measuring individual-level phenotypic proxies could provide a more feasible approach for vertebrates, assuming a close phenotype-genotype resemblance (Edenbrow *et al.* 2017). Those proxies could be estimates of the extent to which traits covary between interaction partners, for example, spatial proximity.

**What type of approach should be followed?** Ideally, questions about the genetic basis of cooperative traits should combine both field observations and controlled laboratory studies. Moreover, insights gained from theoretical modelling of mechanisms underlying cooperation (see Supporting Information) and quantitative genetic modelling, for instance indirect genetic effects, should be considered. While the study of wild populations provides a more realistic picture of selective pressures in nature, a laboratory setting allows for easier control of confounding non-genetic effects (e.g. parental or other transgenerational effects) that potentially distort estimates of heritability (Kasper *et al.*, *in revision*). Ideally, field studies should use cross-fostering techniques to account for and estimate those effects (Hadfield *et al.* 2013). Likewise, laboratory experiments should use offspring of wild-caught individuals to preserve

natural patterns and breadth of genetic variation within the population and avoid artefacts due to genetic drift or lab-specific selection. Furthermore, studying individuals in highly artificial test settings that do not properly reflect the actual biology of a species could lead to ecologically or evolutionarily meaningless results. This caveat is corroborated by recent studies that found an effect of laboratory rearing on gene expression, physiology, behaviour and social dynamics in paper wasps *Polistes fuscatus* (Jandt *et al.* 2015) and an effect of the laboratory environment on prosocial behaviour of chimpanzees (Tennie *et al.* 2016).

**Which methods should be employed?** As with selection of study species, approach, trait, and setting, the most appropriate experimental method depends on the questions being asked. Quantitative genetic methods provide insight on the relative proportions of heritable and several types of environmental variance of cooperative traits and their covariance with other traits, and thus on the inheritance and genetic architecture of a cooperative trait. Combined with selection experiments, they can be used to predict how traits respond to selection. This could be followed up by quantitative trait locus or genome-wide association study approaches to search for candidate genetic polymorphisms that are responsible for phenotypic differences in cooperative tendency. Recent association studies in humans have shown that particular genotypes for the oxytocin receptor (OXTR) gene were highly associated with Asperger Syndrome, a type of autism (Di Napoli, Warrier *et al.* 2014). Particular genotypes may also be associated with OXTR and social empathy as measured through cooperative games (Thompson, Hurd *et al.* 2013). Several new technologies are available for the manipulation of gene expression at the transcriptomic level (e.g. RNA interference, Castel & Martienssen 2013), or by altering genes at the DNA level (e.g. gene editing via CRISPR-Cas, Hsu *et al.* 2014). These approaches could be employed to verify and validate candidate genes once identified by the above approaches. Future studies should incorporate new technologies for detecting genetic and epigenetic signatures of cooperation. For example, comparing genomes between closely related species exhibiting a continuum from solitary life style to advanced sociality may provide insights into the genomic structure underlying cooperation and the evolution of sociality along phylogenetic trees (Fischman *et al.* 2011; Kapheim *et al.* 2015). Furthermore, exploring correlations of epigenetic marks with phenotypic

variation in cooperativeness may provide insight in how gene expression is regulated in response to environmental factors (Jensen 2015; Li-Byarlay 2016). Investigating the stability of those epigenetic marks over time can shed light on the molecular pathways connecting previous social experience to future cooperative behaviour (Cardoso *et al.* 2015; Shpigler *et al.* 2017). Thus, in conclusion, we advocate a holistic approach that integrates complementary methods to unravel the proximate and ultimate causation of cooperation and social evolution, including comparative phenotypic and genomic approaches to tackle questions of adaptation and convergent evolution, the study of norms of reaction and shifts in gene regulatory networks to appreciate the role of phenotypic plasticity, and the study of interactions between individuals and their social and physical environment to unravel the role of natural selection.

## Acknowledgements

We thank the speakers, Jason Wolf, Ian Hardy, Elise Huchard, Anna Lindholm, Etienne Danchin and Nikolaus von Engelhardt, and all attendees of the Workshop on Genetics and Development of Cooperation for inspiring discussions. We would like to thank everyone that helped to organize the workshop, in particular Maria Reyes Contreras and Sakshi Sharda. The manuscript was improved by helpful comments by Nikolaus von Engelhardt, Armando Geraldes and three anonymous reviewers. We acknowledge financial support by the ProDoc program of the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNSF Project 'Proximate and ultimate causes of cooperation') and the Fund for the promotion of young researchers by the Intermediate Staff Organization at the University of Bern (to CK and MV). UE is funded by an IOCB postdoctoral fellowship, RR by a Wallenberg Academy Fellowship awarded to Tobias Uller, and SF by NERC (grant NE/M002977/1 to Paula Stockley). BT acknowledges funding by the SNSF (grants 31003A\_156881 and PDFMP3\_137196 to BT).

## References

- Adams MJ, Robinson MR, Mannarelli M, Hatchwell BJ (2015) Social genetic and social environment effects on parental and helper care in a cooperatively breeding bird. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B - Biological Sciences*, **282**, 20150689.
- Aguilar EG, Akçay E (2016) Gene-culture co-inheritance of a behavioral trait. *bioRxiv*, 69286.
- Amdam G V, Norberg K, Fondrk MK, Page RE (2004) Reproductive ground plan may mediate colony-level selection effects on individual foraging behavior in honey bees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **101**, 11350–5.
- Amdam G V., Norberg K, Hagen A, Omholt SW (2003) Social exploitation of vitellogenin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **100**, 1799–802.
- Anacker AMJ, Beery AK (2013) Life in groups: the roles of oxytocin in mammalian sociality. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, **7**, 185.
- Ancel A, Visser H, Handrich Y, Masman D, Maho Y Le (1997) Energy saving in huddling penguins. *Nature*, **385**, 304–305.
- Aubin-Horth N (2015) Using an integrative approach to investigate the evolution of behaviour. *Evolutionary Applications*, **TBD**, TBD.
- Avital E, Jablonka E (2000) *Animal Traditions: Behavioural Inheritance in Evolution*. Cambridge University Press.
- Beauchamp G (2003) Group-size effects on vigilance: A search for mechanisms. *Behavioural Processes*, **63**, 141–145.
- Bell MB V., Nichols HJ, Gilchrist JS, Cant M a., Hodge SJ (2012) The cost of dominance: suppressing subordinate reproduction affects the reproductive success of dominant female banded mongooses. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **279**, 619–624.
- Bijma P, Wade MJ (2008) The joint effects of kin, multilevel selection and indirect genetic effects on response to genetic selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **21**, 1175–1188.
- Bleakley BH, Brodie IV ED (2009) Indirect genetic effects influence antipredator behavior in

- guppies: Estimates of the coefficient of interaction  $\psi$  and the inheritance of reciprocity. *Evolution*, **63**, 1796–1806.
- Bleakley BH, Wolf JB, Moore AJ (2010) The quantitative genetics of social behaviour. In: *Social Behaviour: Genes, Ecology and Evolution*, pp. 29–54.
- Bonduriansky R, Day T (2009) Nongenetic Inheritance and Its Evolutionary Implications. *Annual Review of Ecology Evolution and Systematics*, **40**, 103–125.
- Bruintjes R, Bonfils D, Heg D, Taborsky M (2011) Paternity of subordinates raises cooperative effort in cichlids. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, 1–7.
- Bruintjes R, Taborsky M (2011) Size-dependent task specialization in a cooperative cichlid in response to experimental variation of demand. *Animal Behaviour*, **81**, 387–394.
- Bshary R, Oliveira RF (2015) Cooperation in animals : toward a game theory within the framework of social competence. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, **3**, 31–37.
- Bshary R, Zuberbühler K, Schaik CP van (2016) Why mutual helping in most natural systems is neither conflict-free nor based on maximal conflict. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, Biological Sciences*, **371**, 20150091.
- Buston P (2003) Social hierarchies: size and growth modification in clownfish. *Nature*, **424**, 145–146.
- Cardoso SD, Teles MC, Oliveira RF (2015) Neurogenomic mechanisms of social plasticity. *The Journal of experimental biology*, **218**, 140–9.
- Carter AJ, English S, Clutton-Brock TH (2014) Cooperative personalities and social niche specialization in female meerkats. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **27**, 815–825.
- Castel SE, Martienssen R a (2013) RNA interference in the nucleus: roles for small RNAs in transcription, epigenetics and beyond. *Nature reviews. Genetics*, **14**, 100–12.
- Cesarini D, Dawes CT, Fowler JH *et al.* (2008) Heritability of cooperative behavior in the trust game. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **105**, 3721–6.
- Chapman BB, Hulthén K, Blomqvist DR *et al.* (2011) To boldly go: Individual differences in boldness influence migratory tendency. *Ecology Letters*, **14**, 871–876.
- Charmantier A, Keyser AJ, Promislow DEL (2007) First evidence for heritable variation in



- 684 cooperative breeding behaviour. *Proceedings. Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **274**,  
685 1757–1761.
- 686 Clutton-Brock TH, Parker G a (1995) Punishment in animal societies. *Nature*, **373**, 209–216.
- 687 Comas D, Piulachs MD, Bellés X (1999) Fast induction of vitellogenin gene expression by juvenile  
688 hormone III in the cockroach *Blattella germanica* (L.) (Dictyoptera, Blattellidae). *Insect*  
689 *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, **29**, 821–827.
- 690 Corona M, Velarde R a, Remolina S *et al.* (2007) Vitellogenin, juvenile hormone, insulin  
691 signaling, and queen honey bee longevity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
692 *Sciences*, **104**, 7128–7133.
- 693 Cram DL, Blount JD, Young AJ (2015) The oxidative costs of reproduction are group-size  
694 dependent in a wild cooperative breeder. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
695 *Sciences*, **282**, 20152031.
- 696 Creel S, Creel NM, Monfort SL (1996) Social stress and dominance. *Nature*, **379**, 212.
- 697 Danchin E, Charmantier A, Champagne FA *et al.* (2011) Beyond DNA: integrating inclusive  
698 inheritance into an extended theory of evolution. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **12**, 475–486.
- 699 Danchin E, Wagner RH (2010) Inclusive heritability: Combining genetic and non-genetic  
700 information to study animal behavior and culture. *Oikos*, **119**, 210–218.
- 701 Danchin E, Wajnberg E, Wagner RH (2014) Avoiding pitfalls in estimating heritability with the  
702 common options approach. *Scientific Reports*, **4**, 3974.
- 703 Day T, Bonduriansky R (2011) A unified approach to the evolutionary consequences of genetic  
704 and nongenetic inheritance. *American Naturalist*, **178**, E18-36.
- 705 Dias BG, Ressler KJ (2014) Parental olfactory experience influences behavior and neural  
706 structure in subsequent generations. *Nature Neuroscience*, **17**, 89–96.
- 707 Donaldson ZR, Young LJ (2008) Oxytocin, vasopressin, and the neurogenetics of sociality.  
708 *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **322**, 900–904.
- 709 De Dreu CKW (2012) Oxytocin modulates cooperation within and competition between groups:  
710 An integrative review and research agenda. *Hormones and Behavior*, **61**, 419–428.
- 711 Dugdale HL, Ellwood SA, Macdonald DW (2010) Alloparental behaviour and long-term costs of  
712 mothers tolerating other members of the group in a plurally breeding mammal. *Animal*

- 713       *Behaviour*, **80**, 721–735.
- 714   Ebstein RP, Israel S, Chew SH, Zhong S, Knafo A (2010) Genetics of Human Social Behavior.
- 715       *Neuron*, **65**, 831–844.
- 716   Edenbrow M, Bleakley BH, Darden SK *et al.* (2017) The Evolution of Cooperation : Interacting
- 717       Phenotypes among Social Partners. , **189**.
- 718   Engel KC, Stökl J, Schweizer R *et al.* (2016) A hormone-related female anti-aphrodisiac signals
- 719       temporary infertility and causes sexual abstinence to synchronize parental care. *Nature*
- 720       *Communications*, **7**, 11035.
- 721   English S, Browning LE, Raihani NJ (2015a) Developmental plasticity and social specialization in
- 722       cooperative societies. *Animal Behaviour*, **106**, 37–42.
- 723   English S, Pen I, Shea N, Uller T (2015b) The information value of non-genetic inheritance in
- 724       plants and animals. *PLoS ONE*, **10**, 1–17.
- 725   Enquist M, Leimar O (1990) The evolution of fatal fighting. *Animal Behaviour*, **39**, 1–9.
- 726   Fawcett TW, Hamblin S, Giraldeau LA (2013) Exposing the behavioral gambit: The evolution of
- 727       learning and decision rules. *Behavioral Ecology*, **24**, 2–11.
- 728   Fehr E, Fischbacher U (2003) The nature of human altruism. *Nature*, **425**, 785–791.
- 729   Ferguson-Gow H, Sumner S, Bourke AFG, Jones KE (2014) Colony size predicts division of labour
- 730       in attine ants. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **281**, 20141411.
- 731   Field J, Leadbeater E (2016) Cooperation between non-relatives in a primitively eusocial paper
- 732       wasp, *Polistes dominula*. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, Biological*
- 733       *Sciences*, **371**, 20150093.
- 734   Fischer S, Bessert-Nettelbeck M, Kotrschal A, Taborsky B (2015) Rearing-Group Size Determines
- 735       Social Competence and Brain Structure in a Cooperatively Breeding Cichlid. *The American*
- 736       *naturalist*, **186**, 123–40.
- 737   Fischer S, Bohn L, Oberhammer E, Wikström C, Taborsky B Divergence of social trajectories is
- 738       triggered interactively by early social and ecological experience. *in revision*.
- 739   Fischer S, Zöttl M, Groenewoud F, Taborsky B (2014) Group-size-dependent punishment of idle
- 740       subordinates in a cooperative breeder where helpers pay to stay. *Proceedings. Biological*
- 741       *sciences / The Royal Society*, **281**, 20140184.

- 742 Fischman BJ, Woodard SH, Robinson GE (2011) Molecular evolutionary analyses of insect  
 743 societies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,  
 744 **108 Suppl**, 10847–54.
- 745 Gadagkar R (2016) Evolution of social behaviour in the primitively eusocial wasp *Ropalidia*  
 746 *marginata*: do we need to look beyond kin selection? *Philosophical Transactions of the*  
 747 *Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological sciences*, **371**, 20150094-.
- 748 Gao S, Becker B, Luo L *et al.* (2016) Oxytocin, the peptide that bonds the sexes also divides  
 749 them. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 7650–7654.
- 750 Goodson JL (2005) The vertebrate social behavior network: Evolutionary themes and variations.  
 751 *Hormones and Behavior*, **48**, 11–22.
- 752 Goodson JL (2013) Deconstructing sociality, social evolution and relevant nonapeptide  
 753 functions. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*, **38**, 465–478.
- 754 Goodson JL, Saldanha CJ, Hahn TP, Soma KK (2005) Recent advances in behavioral  
 755 neuroendocrinology: Insights from studies on birds. *Hormones and Behavior*, **48**, 461–473.
- 756 Grantner A, Taborsky M (1998) The metabolic rates associated with resting, and with the  
 757 performance of agonistic, submissive and digging behaviours in the cichlid fish  
 758 *Neolamprologus pulcher* (Pisces: Cichlidae). *Journal of Comparative Physiology - B*  
 759 *Biochemical, Systemic, and Environmental Physiology*, **168**, 427–433.
- 760 Hadfield JD, Heap EA, Bayer F, Mittell EA, Crouch NMA (2013) Disentangling genetic and  
 761 prenatal sources of familial resemblance across ontogeny in a wild passerine. *Evolution*,  
 762 **67**, 2701–2713.
- 763 Hamilton WD (1964a) The genetical evolution of social behavior II. *Journal of Theoretical*  
 764 *Biology*, **7**, 17–52.
- 765 Hamilton WD (1964b) The genetical evolution of social behaviour I. *Journal of Theoretical*  
 766 *Biology*, **7**, 1–16.
- 767 Handler AM, Postlethwait JH (1978) Regulation of vitellogenin synthesis in *Drosophila* by  
 768 ecdysterone and juvenile hormone. *Journal of Experimental Zoology*, **206**, 247–254.
- 769 Harrison N, Lopes PC, König B (2016) Oxytocin and Social Preference in Female House Mice  
 770 (*Mus musculus domesticus*). *Ethology*, **122**, 571–581.

- 771 Hatchwell BJB, Komdeur J (2000) Ecological constraints, life history traits and the evolution of  
 772 cooperative breeding. *Animal behaviour*, **59**, 1079–1086.
- 773 Hatchwell BJ, Ross DJ, Fowlie MK, McGowan A (2001) Kin discrimination in cooperatively  
 774 breeding long-tailed tits. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **268**, 885–890.
- 775 Heg D, Bachar Z (2006) Cooperative breeding in the Lake Tanganyika cichlid *Julidochromis*  
 776 *ornatus*. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, **76**, 265–281.
- 777 Heg D, Bender N, Hamilton I (2004a) Strategic growth decisions in helper cichlids. *Proceedings*  
 778 *of the Royal Society B*, **271 Suppl**, S505–S508.
- 779 Heg D, Bender N, Hamilton I (2004b) Strategic growth decisions in helper cichlids. *Proceedings*.  
 780 *Biological sciences / The Royal Society*, **271 Suppl**, S505–S508.
- 781 Helanterä H, Uller T (2010) The Price Equation and Extended Inheritance. *Philosophy & Theory*  
 782 *in Biology*, **2**, e101.
- 783 Hofmann HA, Beery AK, Blumstein DT *et al.* (2014) An evolutionary framework for studying  
 784 mechanisms of social behavior. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **29**, 581–589.
- 785 Hsu PD, Lander ES, Zhang F (2014) Development and applications of CRISPR-Cas9 for genome  
 786 engineering. *Cell*, **157**, 1262–1278.
- 787 Huchard E, Charmantier a., English S *et al.* (2014) Additive genetic variance and developmental  
 788 plasticity in growth trajectories in a wild cooperative mammal. *Journal of Evolutionary*  
 789 *Biology*, **27**, 1893–1904.
- 790 Huchard E, English S, Bell MB V, Thavarajah NK, Clutton-Brock TH (2016) Competitive growth in  
 791 a cooperative mammal. *Nature*, **533**, 532–534.
- 792 Insel TR, Shapiro LE (1992) Oxytocin receptor distribution reflects social-organization in  
 793 monogamous and polygamous voles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of*  
 794 *the United States of America*, **89**, 5981–5985.
- 795 Jablonka E, Raz G (2009) Transgenerational epigenetic inheritance: Prevalence, mechanisms,  
 796 and implications for the study of heredity and evolution. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*,  
 797 **84**, 131–176.
- 798 Jaeggi A V., Gurven M (2013) Reciprocity explains food sharing in humans and other primates  
 799 independent of kin selection and tolerated scrounging: a phylogenetic meta-analysis.

- 800 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **280**, 20131615.
- 801 Jandt JM, Thomson JL, Geffre AC, Toth AL (2015) Lab rearing environment perturbs social traits:  
802 A case study with *Polistes* wasps. *Behavioral Ecology*, **26**, 1274–1284.
- 803 Jarvis J (1981) Eusociality in a mammal: cooperative breeding in naked mole-rat colonies.  
804 *Science*, **212**, 571–573.
- 805 Jensen P (2015) Adding “epi-” to behaviour genetics: implications for animal domestication.  
806 *Journal of Experimental Biology*, **218**, 32–40.
- 807 Jenuwein T, Allis CD (2001) Translating the histone code. *Science*, **293**, 1074–1080.
- 808 Jo Manning C, Dewsbury DA, Wakeland EK, Potts WK (1995) Communal nesting and communal  
809 nursing in house mice, *Mus musculus domesticus*. *Animal Behaviour*, **50**, 741–751.
- 810 Johnstone RA (2011) Load lightening and negotiation over offspring care in cooperative  
811 breeders. *Behavioral Ecology*, **22**, 436–444.
- 812 Kaftanoglu O, Linksvayer T a, Page RE (2011) Rearing honey bees, *Apis mellifera*, in vitro 1:  
813 effects of sugar concentrations on survival and development. *Journal of insect science*  
814 *(Online)*, **11**, 96.
- 815 Kapheim KM (2016) Genomic sources of phenotypic novelty in the evolution of eusociality in  
816 insects. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, **13**, 24–32.
- 817 Kapheim KM, Pan H, Li C *et al.* (2015) Group Living. , **348**, 1139–1144.
- 818 Kapranas A, Hardy ICW, Tang X, Gardner A, Li B (2016) Sex ratios, virginity, and local resource  
819 enhancement in a quasisocial parasitoid. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **159**,  
820 243–251.
- 821 Kasper C, Kölliker M, Postma E, Taborsky B Consistent cooperation is caused by maternal and  
822 developmental effects rather than heritable genetic variation. *in revision*.
- 823 Kirkpatrick M, Lande R (1989) The evolution of maternal characters. *Evolution*, **43**, 485–503.
- 824 Koenig WD, Pitelka FA, Carmen WJ, Mumme RL, Stanback MT (1992) The evolution of delayed  
825 dispersal in cooperative breeders. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, **67**, 111–150.
- 826 Komdeur J (2006) Variation in individual investment strategies among social animals. *Ethology*,  
827 **112**, 729–747.
- 828 Laland K, Matthews B, Feldman MW (2016) An introduction to niche construction. *Evolutionary*

- 829       *Ecology*, **30**, 191–202.
- 830   Lande R, Arnold SJ (1983) The measurement of selection on correlated characters. *Evolution*,  
831       **37**, 1210–1226.
- 832   Larose K, Dubois F (2011) Constraints on the Evolution of Reciprocity: An Experimental Test  
833       with Zebra Finches. *Ethology*, **117**, 115–123.
- 834   Lee JS, Smith E, Shilatifard A (2010) The Language of Histone Crosstalk. *Cell*, **142**, 682–685.
- 835   Lehmann L, Keller L (2006) The evolution of cooperation and altruism - A general framework  
836       and a classification of models. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **19**, 1365–1376.
- 837   Leimar O, McNamara JM (2015) The evolution of transgenerational integration of information  
838       in heterogeneous environments. *The American Naturalist*, **185**, E55–E69.
- 839   Levis NA, Pfennig DW (2016) Evaluating “Plasticity-First” Evolution in Nature: Key Criteria and  
840       Empirical Approaches. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **31**, 563–574.
- 841   Lewontin RC (1970) The units of selection. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **1**, 1–18.
- 842   Li-Byarlay H (2016) The Function of DNA Methylation Marks in Social Insects. *Frontiers in*  
843       *Ecology and Evolution*, **4**, 1–8.
- 844   MacNulty DR, Smith DW, Mech LD, Vucetich JA, Packer C (2012) Nonlinear effects of group size  
845       on the success of wolves hunting elk. *Behavioral Ecology*, **23**, 75–82.
- 846   Madden JR, Clutton-Brock TH (2011) Experimental peripheral administration of oxytocin  
847       elevates a suite of cooperative behaviours in a wild social mammal. *Proceedings of the*  
848       *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **278**, 1189–1194.
- 849   Maynard-Smith J, Szathmary E (1997) *The Major Transitions in Evolution*. New York: Oxford  
850       University Press.
- 851   McGlothlin JW, Wolf JB, Brodie ED, Moore AJ (2014) Quantitative genetic versions of Hamilton’s  
852       rule with empirical applications. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London.*  
853       *Series B, Biological sciences*, **369**, 20130358.
- 854   McNamara JM, Houston AI (2005) Conflict between parents over care. *Trends in Ecology and*  
855       *Evolution*, **20**.
- 856   McNamara JM, Houston AI (2009) Integrating function and mechanism. *Trends in Ecology and*  
857       *Evolution*, **24**, 670–675.

- 858 Meffert LM, Hicks SK, Regan JL (2002) Nonadditive genetic effects in animal behavior. *American*  
 859 *Naturalist*, **160**, S198–S213.
- 860 Messias JPM, Paula JR, Grutter AS, Bshary R, Soares MC (2016a) Dopamine disruption increases  
 861 negotiation for cooperative interactions in a fish. *Scientific Reports*, **6**, 20817.
- 862 Messias JPM, Santos TP, Pinto M, Soares MC (2016b) Stimulation of dopamine D 1 receptor  
 863 improves learning capacity in cooperating cleaner fish. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*  
 864 *Biological Sciences*, **283**, 20152272.
- 865 Moore AJ, Brodie ED, Wolf JB (1997) Interacting phenotypes and the evolutionary process : I .  
 866 Direct and indirect genetic effects of social interactions. *Evolution*, **51**, 1352–1362.
- 867 Mousseau T, Fox C (1998) The adaptive significance of maternal effects. *Trends in Ecology &*  
 868 *Evolution*, **13**, 403–407.
- 869 Nummenmaa L, Glerean E, Viinikainen M *et al.* (2012) Emotions promote social interaction by  
 870 synchronizing brain activity across individuals. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
 871 *Sciences*, **109**, 9599–9604.
- 872 O’Connell LA, Hofmann HA (2011a) Genes, hormones, and circuits: An integrative approach to  
 873 study the evolution of social behavior. *Frontiers in Neuroendocrinology*, **32**, 320–335.
- 874 O’Connell LA, Hofmann HA (2011b) The Vertebrate mesolimbic reward system and social  
 875 behavior network: A comparative synthesis. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*, **519**, 3599–  
 876 3639.
- 877 O’Connell LA, Hofmann HA (2011c) The vertebrate mesolimbic reward system and social  
 878 behavior network: A comparative synthesis. *The Journal of Comparative Neurology*, **519**,  
 879 3599–3639.
- 880 O’Connor CM, Marsh-Rollo SE, Ghio SC, Balshine S, Aubin-Horth N (2015) Is there convergence  
 881 in the molecular pathways underlying the repeated evolution of sociality in African  
 882 cichlids? *Hormones and Behavior*, **75**, 160–168.
- 883 Odling-Smee FJ, Laland KN, Feldman MW (2003) *Niche Construction: The Neglected Process in*  
 884 *Evolution*. Princeton University Press.
- 885 Passera L, Roncin E, Kaufmann B, Keller L (1996) Increased soldier production in ant colonies  
 886 exposed to intraspecific competition. *Nature*, **379**, 630–631.

- 887 Platt ML, Seyfarth RM, Cheney DL (2016) Adaptations for social cognition in the primate brain.  
 888 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **371**, 20150096.
- 889 Queller DC (1992) A general model for kin selection. *Evolution*, **2**, 376–380.
- 890 Ratnieks FLW, Wenseleers T (2008) Altruism in insect societies and beyond: voluntary or  
 891 enforced? *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **23**, 45–52.
- 892 Reddon AR, O'Connor CM, Marsh-Rollo SE *et al.* (2015) Brain nonapeptide levels are related to  
 893 social status and affiliative behaviour in a cooperatively breeding cichlid fish. *Royal Society*  
 894 *Open Science*, **2**, 140072.
- 895 Reddon AR, O'Connor CM, Marsh-Rollo SE, Balshine S (2012) Effects of isotocin on social  
 896 responses in a cooperatively breeding fish. *Animal Behaviour*, **84**, 753–760.
- 897 Reddon AR, Voisin MR, O'Connor CM, Balshine S (2014) Isotocin and sociality in the  
 898 cooperatively breeding cichlid fish, *Neolamprologus pulcher*. *Behaviour*, **151**, 1389–1411.
- 899 Rehan SM, Toth AL (2015) Climbing the social ladder: The molecular evolution of sociality.  
 900 *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **30**, 426–433.
- 901 Richerson PJ, Boyd R (1978) A dual inheritance model of the human evolutionary process I:  
 902 Basic postulates and a simple model. *Journal of Social and Biological Systems*, **1**, 127–154.
- 903 Riehl C (2013) Evolutionary routes to non-kin cooperative breeding in birds.
- 904 Rilling JK, DeMarco AC, Hackett PD *et al.* (2012) Effects of intranasal oxytocin and vasopressin  
 905 on cooperative behavior and associated brain activity in men. *Psychoneuroendocrinology*,  
 906 **37**, 447–461.
- 907 Robinson GE, Fernald RD, Clayton DF (2008) Genes and social behavior. *Science (New York,*  
 908 *N.Y.)*, **322**, 896–900.
- 909 Robinson GE, Grozinger CM, Whitfield CW (2005) Sociogenomics: social life in molecular terms.  
 910 *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **6**, 257–70.
- 911 Roy-Zokan EM, Cunningham CB, Hebb LE, McKinney EC, Moore AJ (2015) Vitellogenin and  
 912 vitellogenin receptor gene expression is associated with male and female parenting in a  
 913 subsocial insect. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **282**, 20150787.
- 914 Russell AF, Langmore NE, Cockburn A, Astheimer LB, Kilner RM (2007) Reduced egg investment  
 915 can conceal helper effects in cooperatively breeding birds. *Science*, **317**, 941–944.



- 916 Russell AF, Lummaa V (2009) Maternal effects in cooperative breeders: from hymenopterans to  
 917 humans. *Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological*  
 918 *sciences*, **364**, 1143–1167.
- 919 Sabatier L, Jouanguy E, Dostert C *et al.* (2003) Pherokine-2 and -3: Two *Drosophila* molecules  
 920 related to pheromone/odor-binding proteins induced by viral and bacterial infections.  
 921 *European Journal of Biochemistry*, **270**, 3398–3407.
- 922 Sachs JL, Mueller UG, Wilcox TP, Bull JJ (2004) The evolution of cooperation. *The Quarterly*  
 923 *Review of Biology*, **79**, 135–160.
- 924 Sallet J, Mars RB, Noonan MP *et al.* (2011) Social network size affects neural circuits in  
 925 macaques. *Science*, **334**, 697–700.
- 926 Sanderson J, Nichols H, Marshall H *et al.* (2015a) Elevated glucocorticoid concentrations during  
 927 gestation predict reduced reproductive success in subordinate female banded mongooses.  
 928 *Biology Letters*, **11**, 4–8.
- 929 Sanderson JL, Stott I, Young AJ *et al.* (2015b) The origins of consistent individual differences in  
 930 cooperation in wild banded mongooses, *Mungos mungo*. *Animal Behaviour*, **107**, 193–200.
- 931 Schmidt J, Kosztolányi A, Tököllyi J *et al.* (2015) Reproductive asynchrony and infanticide in  
 932 house mice breeding communally. *Animal Behaviour*, **101**, 201–211.
- 933 Schwander T, Lo N, Beekman M, Oldroyd BP, Keller L (2010) Nature versus nurture in social  
 934 insect caste differentiation. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, **25**, 275–282.
- 935 Sharp SP, Clutton-Brock TH (2011) Reluctant challengers: Why do subordinate female meerkats  
 936 rarely displace their dominant mothers? *Behavioral Ecology*, **22**, 1337–1343.
- 937 Sharp SP, McGowan A, Wood MJ, Hatchwell BJ (2005) Learned kin recognition cues in a social  
 938 bird. *Nature*, **434**, 1127–1130.
- 939 Sheng Z, Xu J, Bai H, Zhu F, Palli SR (2011) Juvenile hormone regulates vitellogenin gene  
 940 expression through insulin-like peptide signaling pathway in the red flour beetle, *Tribolium*  
 941 *castaneum*. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*, **286**, 41924–41936.
- 942 Shpigler HY, Saul MC, Murdoch EE *et al.* (2017) Behavioral, transcriptomic and epigenetic  
 943 responses to social challenge in honey bees. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, 1–13.
- 944 Soares MC, Bshary R, Fusani L *et al.* (2010) Hormonal mechanisms of cooperative behaviour.

- 945 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences*, **365**, 2737–  
946 2750.
- 947 Soares MC, Paula JR, Bshary R (2016) Serotonin blockade delays learning performance in a  
948 cooperative fish. *Animal Cognition*, **19**, 1027–1030.
- 949 Sreenivas AG, Hardy ICW (2016) Mutual interference reduces offspring production in a brood-  
950 guarding bethylid wasp. *Entomologia Experimentalis et Applicata*, **159**, 260–269.
- 951 Steller MM, Kambhampati S, Caragea D (2010) Comparative analysis of expressed sequence  
952 tags from three castes and two life stages of the termite *Reticulitermes flavipes*. *BMC*  
953 *Genomics*, **11**, 463.
- 954 Stiver KA, Dierkes P, Taborsky M, Balshine S (2004) Dispersal patterns and status change in a co-  
955 operatively breeding cichlid *Neolamprologus pulcher*: Evidence from microsatellite  
956 analyses and behavioural observations. *Journal of Fish Biology*, **65**, 91–105.
- 957 Suzuki MM, Bird A (2008) DNA methylation landscapes: provocative insights from epigenomics.  
958 *Nature reviews. Genetics*, **9**, 465–76.
- 959 Taborsky M (1994) Sneakers, Satellites and Helpers: Parasitic and Cooperative Behaviour in Fish  
960 Reproduction. *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, **23**.
- 961 Taborsky M, Frommen JG, Riehl C (2016) Correlated pay-offs are key to cooperation.  
962 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, Biological Sciences*, **371**, 20150084.
- 963 Taborsky M, Hofmann HA, Beery AK *et al.* (2015) Taxon matters: Promoting integrative studies  
964 of social behavior: NESCent Working Group on Integrative Models of Vertebrate Sociality:  
965 Evolution, Mechanisms, and Emergent Properties. *Trends in Neurosciences*, **38**, 189–191.
- 966 Taborsky B, Oliveira RF (2012) Social competence: An evolutionary approach. *Trends in Ecology*  
967 *and Evolution*, **27**, 679–688.
- 968 Taborsky B, Skubic E, Bruintjes R (2007) Mothers adjust egg size to helper number in a  
969 cooperatively breeding cichlid. *Behavioral Ecology*, **18**, 652–657.
- 970 Taborsky M, Taborsky B (2015) Evolution of genetic and physiological mechanisms of  
971 cooperative behaviour. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, **6**, 132–138.
- 972 Tennie C, Jensen K, Call J (2016) The nature of prosociality in chimpanzees. *Nature*  
973 *Communications*, **7**, 13915.




- 974 Thompson RR, Walton JC (2004) Peptide effects on social behavior: effects of vasotocin and  
 975 isotocin on social approach behavior in male goldfish (*Carassius auratus*). *Behavioral*  
 976 *neuroscience*, **118**, 620–626.
- 977 Tinbergen N (1963) On aims and methods of ethology. *Zeitschrift für Tierpsychologie*, **20**, 410–  
 978 433.
- 979 Toth AL, Rehan SM (2017) Molecular evolution in insect societies: an eco-evo-devo synthesis.  
 980 *Annual Review of Entomology*, **62**, 419–442.
- 981 Trapp J, McAfee A, Foster LJ (2016) Genomics, transcriptomics and proteomics: Enabling  
 982 insights into social evolution and disease challenges for managed and wild bees. *Molecular*  
 983 *Ecology*.
- 984 Uller T (2008) Developmental plasticity and the evolution of parental effects. *Trends in Ecology*  
 985 *and Evolution*, **23**, 432–438.
- 986 Uller T, Helanterä H Heredity in evolutionary theory. In: *Challenges to Evolutionary Biology:*  
 987 *Development and Heredity* (eds Huneman P, Walsh D), p. . Oxford University Press.
- 988 Voelkl B, Fritz J (2017) Relation between travel strategy and social organization of migrating  
 989 birds with special consideration of formation flight in the northern bald ibis. *Philosophical*  
 990 *Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 20160235.
- 991 Voelkl B, Portugal SJ, Unsöld M *et al.* (2015) Matching times of leading and following suggest  
 992 cooperation through direct reciprocity during V-formation flight in ibis. *Proceedings of the*  
 993 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **112**, 2115–20.
- 994 Weidt A, Hofmann SE, König B (2008) Not only mate choice matters: fitness consequences of  
 995 social partner choice in female house mice. *Animal Behaviour*, **75**, 801–808.
- 996 Weidt A, Lindholm AK, König B (2014) Communal nursing in wild house mice is not a by-product  
 997 of group living: Females choose. *Naturwissenschaften*, **101**, 73–76.
- 998 Weitekamp CA, Hofmann HA (2014) Evolutionary themes in the neurobiology of social  
 999 cognition. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology*, **28**, 22–27.
- 1000 West-Eberhard MJ (2003) *Developmental Plasticity and Evolution*. Oxford University Press, New  
 1001 York.
- 1002 West SA, Gardner A (2013) Adaptation and Inclusive Fitness. *Current Biology*, **23**, R577–R584.


- 1003 West SA, Griffin AS, Gardner A (2007) Social semantics: Altruism, cooperation, mutualism,  
 1004 strong reciprocity and group selection. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **20**, 415–432.
- 1005 Wilkinson GS, Carter GG, Bohn KM, Adams DM (2016) Non-kin cooperation in bats.  
 1006 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, Biological Sciences*, **371**, 20150095.
- 1007 Wilson EO (1971) *The Insect Societies*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- 1008 Wong M, Balshine S (2011) The evolution of cooperative breeding in the African cichlid fish,  
 1009 *Neolamprologus pulcher*. *Biological Reviews*, **86**, 511–530.
- 1010 Zöttl M, Chapuis L, Freiburghaus M, Taborsky M (2013) Strategic reduction of help before  
 1011 dispersal in a cooperative breeder. *Biology Letters*, **9**, 20120878–20120878.
- 1012 Zöttl M, Vulllioud P, Mendonça R *et al.* (2016) Differences in cooperative behavior among  
 1013 Damaraland mole rats are consequences of an age-related polyethism. *Proceedings of the*  
 1014 *National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 201607885.
- 1015

## Figure Legends

Figure 1. Indirect genetic effects on cooperation. An individual's own genes and its environment jointly influence its cooperation phenotype (direct genetic effect, solid black line), which influences the focal's fitness ('non-social selection gradient',  $\beta_N$ ). Cooperative behaviours are expressed in a social setting that constitutes a component of the environment. **A** Non-reciprocal indirect genetic effect: A cooperation partner's genes influence the focal's phenotype indirectly via the partner's phenotype (indirect genetic effect, dashed black line). The strength of the influence of the genes in the social environment on the focal's phenotype is reflected by the interaction effect coefficient,  $\psi$ , and thus the focal's fitness is affected by genes expressed in other individuals ('social selection gradient',  $\beta_S$ ). **B** Two different traits expressed in two individuals influence each other reciprocally. For instance, the focal individual grooms its partner, which leads to an increased tolerance towards the focal ( $\psi_{1,2}$ ), which, in turn, results in more grooming by the focal ( $\psi_{2,1}$ ). **C** The same trait expressed in two different individuals influences itself reciprocally. For instance, the focal's propensity to share food with its partner could increase the partner's propensity to share food and vice versa ( $\psi_{1,1}$ ). Assuming a  $\psi$  of 0.75, the feed-back loops depicted in B and C lead to a 5 and 9-fold increase in the evolutionary rate compared to models without IGEs (Moore *et al.* 1997).

Figure 2. Non-genetic inheritance indicated on the information retention axis (in grey). The information retention axis symbolises the time scale at which information needs to be retained in a biological system to be adaptive. This adaptiveness depends on the variability of the selective environment. There is scope for non-genetic inheritance when information needs to be transferred over generations (arrow pointing to the right) and the environment is too variable for genes to adapt (arrow to the left). The number of generations, the time scale and the variability of the environment are conceptual examples - roughly at scale - and are study system specific. The types of information and the information carriers are hypothetical examples.

**A****B****C**



# ***Molecular Ecology***

Supporting Information

## **Genetics and developmental biology of cooperation**

Claudia Kasper<sup>1\*§</sup>, Maddalena Vierbuchen<sup>1\*</sup>, Ulrich Ernst<sup>2</sup>, Stefan Fischer<sup>3</sup>, Reinder Radersma<sup>4</sup>, Aura Raulo<sup>5</sup>, Filipa Cunha-Saraiva<sup>6</sup>, Min Wu<sup>7</sup>, Kenyon Mobley<sup>8,9#</sup> & Barbara Taborsky<sup>1#</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institute for Ecology and Evolution, University of Bern, Switzerland

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Organic Chemistry and Biochemistry of the Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague, Czech Republic

<sup>3</sup>Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biology, University of Lund, Sweden

<sup>5</sup>Department of Zoology, University of Oxford

<sup>6</sup>Konrad Lorenz Institute of Ethology, Department of integrative Biology and Evolution, Vetmeduni Vienna, Austria

<sup>7</sup>Department of Environmental Sciences, Evolution & Zoology, University of Basel, Switzerland

<sup>8</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolution, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

<sup>9</sup>Department of Evolutionary Ecology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Biology, Germany

\*and # equal contributions

§Corresponding author: [claudia.kasper@iee.unibe.ch](mailto:claudia.kasper@iee.unibe.ch)



## Table of content

Workshop speakers and participants	3
Genetic and molecular mechanisms of cooperative behaviours across taxa	4
Multilevel cooperation - case study 'Cooperation and microbiota'	6
Future avenues of modelling the evolution of cooperation	8
References	8

## Workshop speakers and participants

Jason Wolf (University of Bath, UK) spoke about the need to incorporate the social environment as a part of the genetic architecture of cooperative traits into quantitative genetics models. Ian Hardy (University of Nottingham) provided a detailed case study of cooperative brood care and resource conflict within bathylid wasps. Elise Huchard (CNRS Montpellier, France) presented her work on the interplay of genes and environment in shaping growth trajectories of cooperatively breeding meerkats. Anna Lindholm (University of Zurich, Switzerland) led a discussion session on how to select suitable systems, which molecular methods should be applied, in which cases controlled laboratory studies should be preferred to field observations, and which parameters should be measured. Etienne Danchin (CNRS Toulouse, France) detailed various empirical studies demonstrating modes of non-genetic inheritance, social information, and their evolutionary implications. The broader theoretical implications of non-genetic inheritance to sociobiology and evolution of cooperative behaviour were discussed in a session led by Reinder Radersma (University of Lund, Sweden), while Nikolaus von Engelhardt (Plymouth University, UK) led a discussion session about physiological mechanisms and their role in cooperation.

The workshop was organized by Claudia Kasper and Maddalena Vierbuchen from the University of Bern, Switzerland, and attended by the following persons (given in alphabetical order): Laurie Belcher (University of Bath, UK), Rhiannon Bolton (University of Liverpool, UK), Christelle Couchoux (University of Sussex, UK), Filipa Cunha-Saraiva (KLIVV, University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna, Austria), Jeremy Field (University of Sussex, UK), Stefan Fischer (University of Liverpool, UK), Janaina Lima de Oliveira (University of Bath, UK), Kenyon Mobley (University of Lausanne, Switzerland), Philip Madgwick (University of Bath, UK), Aura Raulo (University of Helsinki, Finland), Maria Reyes (University of Bern, Switzerland), Eva Schultner (University of Helsinki, Finland), Sakshi Sharda, Barbara Taborsky and Michael Taborsky (University of Bern, Switzerland), Bernhard Völkl (Vetsuisse Bern, Switzerland), Mukta Watve and Cecilia Wikström (University of Bern, Switzerland), Min Wu (University of Basel, Switzerland).

## Genetic and physiological mechanisms of cooperative behaviours across taxa

**Table S1.** Examples of genetic and physiological mechanisms for cooperation across taxonomic groups indicating whether a genetic polymorphism (GP) has been identified, or whether differential gene expression in hormones and their receptors are responsible for phenotypic differences (DGE). We also present studies that identified differences in hormone levels (HL) or distribution of hormone receptors (RD) as the mechanism underlying cooperative phenotypes.

	System	Type of cooperative behaviour	Mechanism	GP	DGE	HL	RD	Citations
Proteo-bacteria	<i>Vibrio fischeri</i>	Quorum sensing/bioluminescence	<i>Ain</i> and <i>lux</i> proteins	X				(Lupp & Ruby 2005)
	<i>Myxococcus xanthus</i>	Fruiting bodies to survive starvation	PX mutation	X				(Fiegna <i>et al.</i> 2006)
Amoebozoa	Slime molds ( <i>Dictyostelium discoideum</i> )	Colony formation	<i>dimA</i>	X				(Foster <i>et al.</i> 2004)
Plants	<i>Volvox carteri</i>	Reproductive altruism	<i>RegA/SAND-like domain</i>	X	X			(Kirk <i>et al.</i> 1999; Nedelcu & Michod 2006)
Fungi	Budding yeast ( <i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i> )	Biofilm-like cooperation	<i>FLO-1</i>	X				(Smukalla <i>et al.</i> 2008)
Animals	<i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>	Social vs. solitary feeding behaviour	<i>Npr-1</i>			X	X	(Macosko <i>et al.</i> 2009)
Insects	Honeybee ( <i>Apis mellifera</i> )	Division of reproductive castes and labour	Insulin-juvenile hormone-vitellogenin pathway, vitellogenin receptor, <i>Anarchy</i>		X	X		(Amdam <i>et al.</i> 2003; Corona <i>et al.</i> 2016; Ronai <i>et al.</i> 2016a; b)
	Termites ( <i>Cryptotermes secundus</i> )	Reproductive division of labour	<i>Neofem2</i>		X			(Korb <i>et al.</i> 2009)
	Ants ( <i>Solenopsis invicta</i> )	Monogynous/polygynous colony (supergene/'social chromosome')	Gp-9	X				(Keller & Ross 1998; Wang <i>et al.</i> 2013)
	Ants ( <i>Polyrhachis moesta</i> )	Queens cooperate (have nest together)	Octopamine			X		(Koyama <i>et al.</i> 2015)
	Earwigs ( <i>Forficula auricularia</i> )	Parent-offspring co-adaptation, maternal care	PebIII, Th, juvenile hormone-vitellogenin pathway and vitellogenin receptor		X			Wu <i>et al.</i> , unpublished
	Burying beetles ( <i>Nicrophorus vespilloides</i> )	Parental care	juvenile hormone-vitellogenin pathway and vitellogenin receptor		X			(Roy-Zokan <i>et al.</i> 2015; Engel <i>et al.</i> 2016)
Teleosts	Gold fish ( <i>Carassius auratus</i> )	Social approach behaviour, vasotocine inhibits social approach, isotocine stimulates it	arginine vasotocin/isotocin			X		(Thompson & Walton 2004)
	Lamprologine cichlids	Social behaviour expression	arginine vasotocin/arginine vasotocin receptor isotocin, isotocin receptor 1, isotocin receptor 2		X	X		(O'Connor <i>et al.</i> 2015; Reddon <i>et al.</i> 2015)
Birds	Ruff ( <i>Philomachus pugnax</i> )	Cooperative male-male relationships (different mating phenotypes) in leks	Androsteroid homeostasis (HSD17B2)	X				(Küpper <i>et al.</i> 2015; Lamichhaney <i>et al.</i> 2015)
	Great tits and blue tits ( <i>Parus major</i> , <i>Cyanistes caeruleus</i> )	Parental care and corticosterone levels covary	corticosterone, testosterone			X		studies cited in (Hau & Goymann 2015)
	White-throated sparrows ( <i>Zonotrichia albicollis</i> )	Parental care; monogamy, aggression differences between white and tan morph (morph is det. by supergene)	Steroid metabolism; serotonin	X				(Tuttle <i>et al.</i> 2016)

Mammals	Meerkats ( <i>Suricata suricatta</i> )	'Cooperative syndrome' (increased digging, guarding, pup-feeding and associating with pups; decreased aggression)	oxytocin			X		(Madden & Clutton-Brock 2011)
	Domestic dog ( <i>Canis lupus</i> )	Social bonds	oxytocin			X		(Romero <i>et al.</i> 2014)
	Rodents general	Species differences in alloparental care	oxytocin receptor				X	(Olazábal & Young 2006)
	Mice ( <i>Mus musculus</i> )	Communal nesting & lactation	oxytocin			X		(Harrison <i>et al.</i> 2016)
	Rats ( <i>Rattus norvegicus</i> )	Maternal care; epigenetic (cytosine methylation)	Estrogen receptor ER- $\alpha$		X			(Champagne <i>et al.</i> 2006)
	Rats ( <i>Rattus norvegicus</i> )	coordination during cooperative task	Norepinephrine, serotonin, dopamine			X		(Tsoory <i>et al.</i> 2012)
	<i>Peromyscus californicus</i> , <i>P. maniculatus</i> (monogamous vs polygamous species)	Pair bond as a proxy for group living	V1aR/ oxytocin receptor				X	(Young <i>et al.</i> 2001; Hammock & Young 2005; Anacker & Beery 2013)
	Prairie voles ( <i>Microtus ochrogaster</i> )	Reduced alloparental effort in males when treated with antagonist	oxytocin			X		(Bales & Carter 2003)
	Tuco-tucos ( <i>Ctenomys sociabilis</i> & <i>C. haigi</i> )	Communal nesting	oxytocin receptor				X	(Anacker & Beery 2013)
	Naked mole rats ( <i>Heterocephalus glaber</i> )	Cooperative breeding/eusociality	oxytocin receptor				X	(Anacker & Beery 2013)
	New World primates general	Social behaviour	oxytocin / oxytocin receptor and arginine vasopressin /Va1 receptor	X				(Bergey <i>et al.</i> 2016; French 2016)
	Vervet monkeys ( <i>Chlorocebus aethiops</i> , <i>C. pygerythrus</i> )	Parental care/parent-offspring interaction	dopamine receptor D4	X				(Kaitz <i>et al.</i> 2010; Fairbanks <i>et al.</i> 2012)
	Chimpanzees ( <i>Pan troglodytes</i> )	Building cooperative relationships; oxytocin levels elevated after grooming	oxytocin			X		(Crockford <i>et al.</i> 2013)
	Chimpanzees ( <i>Pan troglodytes</i> )	Kin and non-kin bonds, food sharing	oxytocin			X		(Wittig <i>et al.</i> 2014)
	Humans ( <i>Homo sapiens</i> )	Pro-social behaviour (dictator game)	arginine vasopressin receptor 1a; receptor S 3 repeat	X				(Knafo <i>et al.</i> 2008; Avinun <i>et al.</i> 2011)
		Pro-social behaviour (dictator game; social value orientation task), Autism	oxytocin receptor	X				(Israel <i>et al.</i> 2009; di Napoli <i>et al.</i> 2014)
		Social behaviour/ parental care/parent-offspring interaction, Self-reported social behaviour	dopamine receptor D4, dopamine receptor D5, IGF2	X				(Bakermans-Kranenburg & Ijzendoorn 2006; Sheese <i>et al.</i> 2007)
		Donation behaviour	COMT Val158Met (rs4680)	X				(Reuter <i>et al.</i> 2011), but see (Anacker & Beery 2013) (no effect)
		Self-reported social behaviour	GABRB2 (rs187269)	X				(Tsang <i>et al.</i> 2013)

### **Multilevel cooperation - case study 'Cooperation and microbiota'**

An important future avenue to understand the complexity of cooperation lies in the study of 'multilevel' cooperation. Recent evidence highlights that individual behaviours are not only influenced by the properties of the cooperation partners and the group (Carpenter 2004; West *et al.* 2007), but also by the properties of higher organizational levels of sociality (West & Gardner 2013). For example, the presence or absence of conflict between groups is predicted to influence within-group social behaviours and may ultimately determine the amount of cooperation (Radford *et al.* 2016). Specifically, we believe that the field of microbiome science will highlight a unique 'multilevel' perspective on cooperation. While cooperative systems have been studied in various scales from genes to cell organelles, single-celled organisms like bacteria (Rakoff-Nahoum *et al.* 2016), to multi-cellular organisms (Maynard-Smith & Szathmary 1997; Bourke 2011), a simultaneous, "multi-level" perspective on the cooperation of bacteria with their host species is still lacking. Microbiota, the mutualistic bacteria living in and on their host vertebrates, form a functionally essential part of their host phenotype through complex interactions that can be seen as a form of multilevel-multispecies cooperation: the bacteria cooperating within, but also with their host. Furthermore, several authors suggested mutualistic microbes as a factor driving the evolution of social behaviour or the initial sociality (Troyer 1984; Lombardo 2008; Ezenwa *et al.* 2012; Montiel-Castro *et al.* 2013), a pre-requisite of host cooperative behaviour. This is because transmission of microbes through social contact has the potential to both enhance host immunity (Troyer 1984; Lombardo 2008; Archie & Theis 2011; Gilbert *et al.* 2015) and directly affect host social behaviour (Bravo *et al.* 2011; Ezenwa *et al.* 2012; Montiel-Castro *et al.* 2013). In this way immunological factors, mainly microbiota, can create a positive feedback loop in the evolution of sociality (Fig. 3). The consequence of a more synchronized, diverse and resilient microbiota within a host social group can be seen by itself as a form of multi-level immunological cooperation, analogous to behavioural cooperative defence mechanisms.




Figure 3. Evolutionary framework for positive feedback loop of host social behavior and social transmission of microbiota. Socially transmittable microbiota has the potential to manipulate host behaviour as well as enhance host immunity and subsequent fitness.

## Future avenues of modelling the evolution of cooperation

Cooperation is a flexible and complex trait. It is now apparent that adaptive cooperative behaviour is not shaped solely by genes, but also by non-genetic environmental factors. So far, satisfactory explanations for the evolution of decision rules of animal cooperation and the evolution of the genetic architecture and cognitive mechanisms underpinning these rules are largely lacking. Although this field is still in its infancy, promising first theoretical results demonstrating that the particular mechanisms clearly play a role in determining evolutionary outcome (Akçay & Van Cleve 2012; Berg & Weissing 2015; Quiñones *et al.* 2016). For instance, (Berg & Weissing 2015) showed that different behavioural architectures (1:1 genotype-phenotype mapping vs. a neural network) or different mutation regimes greatly influence decisions in cooperative games and consequently the dynamics and outcome of social evolution. These findings challenge the standard optimality theory often used to model cooperation. Theory thus may need a paradigm shift towards considering underlying mechanisms, rather than behavioural outcomes, as target of selection (Fawcett *et al.* 2013).

## References

- Akçay E, Van Cleve J (2012) Behavioral responses in structured populations pave the way to group optimality. *The American naturalist*, **179**, 257–69.
- Amdam G V., Norberg K, Hagen A, Omholt SW (2003) Social exploitation of vitellogenin. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **100**, 1799–802.
- Anacker AMJ, Beery AK (2013) Life in groups: the roles of oxytocin in mammalian sociality. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, **7**, 185.
- Archie EA, Theis KR (2011) Animal behaviour meets microbial ecology. *Animal Behaviour*, **82**, 425–436.
- Avinun R, Israel S, Shalev I *et al.* (2011) Avpr1a variant associated with preschoolers' lower altruistic behavior. *PLoS ONE*, **6**, 1–5.
- Bakermans-Kranenburg MJ, Ijzendoorn MH (2006) Gene-environment interaction of the dopamine D4 receptor (DRD4) and observed maternal insensitivity predicting externalizing behavior in preschoolers. *Developmental Psychobiology*, **48**, 406–409.

- Bales KL, Carter CS (2003) Sex differences and developmental effects of oxytocin on aggression and social behavior in prairie voles (*Microtus ochrogaster*). *Hormones and Behavior*, **44**, 178–184.
- Berg P Van Den, Weissing FJ (2015) The importance of mechanisms for the evolution of cooperation.
- Bergey CM, Phillips-Conroy JE, Disotell TR, Jolly CJ (2016) Dopamine pathway is highly diverged in primate species that differ markedly in social behavior. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 201525530.
- Bourke AFG (2011) *Principles of Social Evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Bravo JA, Forsythe P, Chew M V *et al.* (2011) Ingestion of *Lactobacillus* strain regulates emotional behavior and central GABA receptor expression in a mouse via the vagus nerve. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **108**, 16050–5.
- Carpenter JP (2004) Punishing free-riders: How group size affects mutual monitoring and the provision of public goods. *IZA Discussion paper series*, **1337**.
- Champagne FA, Weaver ICG, Diorio J *et al.* (2006) Maternal care associated with methylation of the estrogen receptor- $\alpha$ 1b promoter and estrogen receptor- $\alpha$  expression in the medial preoptic area of female offspring. *Endocrinology*, **147**, 2909–2915.
- Corona M, Libbrecht R, Wheeler DE (2016) Molecular mechanisms of phenotypic plasticity in social insects. *Current Opinion in Insect Science*, **13**, 55–60.
- Crockford C, Wittig RM, Langergraber K *et al.* (2013) Urinary oxytocin and social bonding in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **280**, 20122765–20122765.
- Engel KC, Stökl J, Schweizer R *et al.* (2016) A hormone-related female anti-aphrodisiac signals temporary infertility and causes sexual abstinence to synchronize parental care. *Nature Communications*, **7**, 11035.
- Ezenwa VO, Gerardo NM, Inouye DW, Medina M, Xavier JB (2012) Animal Behavior and the Microbiome. *Science*, **338**, 198–199.
- Fairbanks LA, Way BM, Breidenthal SE, Bailey JN, Jorgensen MJ (2012) Maternal and offspring dopamine D4 receptor genotypes interact to influence juvenile impulsivity in vervet monkeys. *Psychological science*, **23**, 1099–1104.



- Fawcett TW, Hamblin S, Giraldeau LA (2013) Exposing the behavioral gambit: The evolution of learning and decision rules. *Behavioral Ecology*, **24**, 2–11.
- Fiegna F, Yu YN, Kadam S V, Velicer GJ (2006) Evolution of an obligate social cheater to a superior cooperator. *Nature*, **441**, 310–314.
- Foster KR, Shaulsky G, Strassmann JE, Queller DC, Thompson CRL (2004) Pleiotropy as a mechanism to stabilize cooperation. *Nature*, **431**, 693–696.
- French JA (2016) Genes, dopamine pathways, and sociality in primates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **113**, 201605972.
- Gilbert SF, Bosch TCG, Ledón-Rettig C (2015) Eco-Evo-Devo: developmental symbiosis and developmental plasticity as evolutionary agents. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, **16**, 611–622.
- Hammock EAD, Young LJ (2005) Microsatellite Instability Generates Diversity in Brain and Sociobehavioral Traits. *Science*, **308**, 1630–1634.
- Harrison N, Lopes PC, König B (2016) Oxytocin and Social Preference in Female House Mice (*Mus musculus domesticus*). *Ethology*, **122**, 571–581.
- Hau M, Goymann W (2015) Endocrine mechanisms, behavioral phenotypes and plasticity: known relationships and open questions. *Frontiers in Zoology*, **12**, S7.
- Israel S, Lerer E, Shalev I *et al.* (2009) The oxytocin receptor (OXTR) contributes to prosocial fund allocations in the Dictator Game and the social value orientations task. *PLoS ONE*, **4**.
- Kaitz M, Shalev I, Sapir N *et al.* (2010) Mothers' dopamine receptor polymorphism modulates the relation between infant fussiness and sensitive parenting. *Developmental Psychobiology*, **52**, 149–157.
- Keller L, Ross KG (1998) Selfish genes: a green beard in the red fire ant. *Nature*, **394**, 573–575.
- Kirk MM, Stark K, Miller SM *et al.* (1999) *regA*, a *Volvox* gene that plays a central role in germ-soma differentiation, encodes a novel regulatory protein. *Development (Cambridge, England)*, **126**, 639–647.
- Knafo A, Israel S, Darvasi A *et al.* (2008) Individual differences in allocation of funds in the dictator game associated with length of the arginine vasopressin 1a receptor RS3 promoter region and correlation between RS3 length and hippocampal mRNA. *Genes, Brain and Behavior*, **7**, 266–275.

- Korb J, Weil T, Hoffmann K, Foster KR, Rehli M (2009) A gene necessary for reproductive suppression in termites. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, **324**, 758.
- Koyama S, Matsui S, Satoh T, Sasaki K (2015) Octopamine and cooperation : octopamine regulates the disappearance of cooperative behaviours between genetically unrelated founding queens in the ant.
- Küpper C, Stocks M, Risse JE *et al.* (2015) A supergene determines highly divergent male reproductive morphs in the ruff. *Nature Publishing Group*, **48**, 79–83.
- Lamichhaney S, Fan G, Widemo F *et al.* (2015) Structural genomic changes underlie alternative reproductive strategies in the ruff (*Philomachus pugnax*). *Nature Genetics*, **48**, 84–88.
- Lombardo MP (2008) Access to mutualistic endosymbiotic microbes: An underappreciated benefit of group living. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **62**, 479–497.
- Lupp C, Ruby EG (2005) *Vibrio fischeri* Uses Two Quorum-Sensing Systems for the Regulation of Early and Late Colonization Factors *Vibrio fischeri* Uses Two Quorum-Sensing Systems for the Regulation of Early and Late Colonization Factors. , **187**, 3620–3629.
- Macosko EZ, Pokala N, Feinberg EH *et al.* (2009) A hub-and-spoke circuit drives pheromone attraction and social behaviour in *C. elegans*. *Nature*, **458**, 1171–5.
- Madden JR, Clutton-Brock TH (2011) Experimental peripheral administration of oxytocin elevates a suite of cooperative behaviours in a wild social mammal. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **278**, 1189–1194.
- Maynard-Smith J, Szathmary E (1997) *The Major Transitions in Evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Montiel-Castro AJ, González-Cervantes RM, Bravo-Ruiseco G, Pacheco-López G (2013) The microbiota-gut-brain axis: neurobehavioral correlates, health and sociality. *Frontiers in integrative neuroscience*, **7**, 70.
- di Napoli A, Warrier V, Baron-Cohen S, Chakrabarti B (2014) Genetic variation in the oxytocin receptor (OXTR) gene is associated with Asperger Syndrome. *Molecular Autism*, **5**, 48.
- Nedelcu AM, Michod RE (2006) The evolutionary origin of an altruistic gene. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **23**, 1460–1464.

- O'Connor CM, Marsh-Rollo SE, Ghio SC, Balshine S, Aubin-Horth N (2015) Is there convergence in the molecular pathways underlying the repeated evolution of sociality in African cichlids? *Hormones and Behavior*, **75**, 160–168.
- Olazábal DE, Young LJ (2006) Species and individual differences in juvenile female alloparental care are associated with oxytocin receptor density in the striatum and the lateral septum. *Hormones and Behavior*, **49**, 681–687.
- Quiñones AE, Doorn GS van, Pen I, Weissing FJ, Taborsky M (2016) Negotiation and appeasement can be more effective drivers of sociality than kin selection. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B*, **371**, 20150089.
- Radford AN, Majolo B, Aureli F (2016) Within-group behavioural consequences of between-group conflict: a prospective review. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **283**, 20161567.
- Rakoff-Nahoum S, Foster KR, Comstock LE (2016) The evolution of cooperation within the gut microbiota. *Nature*, **533**, 255–259.
- Reddon AR, O'Connor CM, Marsh-Rollo SE *et al.* (2015) Brain nonapeptide levels are related to social status and affiliative behaviour in a cooperatively breeding cichlid fish. *Royal Society Open Science*, **2**, 140072.
- Reuter M, Frenzel C, Walter NT, Markett S, Montag C (2011) Investigating the genetic basis of altruism: The role of the COMT Val158Met polymorphism. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, **6**, 662–668.
- Romero T, Nagasawa M, Mogi K, Hasegawa T, Kikusui T (2014) Oxytocin promotes social bonding in dogs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **111**, 9085–90.
- Ronai I, Oldroyd BP, Barton DA *et al.* (2016a) Anarchy is a molecular signature of worker sterility in the honey bee. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*, **33**, 134–142.
- Ronai I, Vergoz V, Oldroyd BP (2016b) The Mechanistic, Genetic, and Evolutionary Basis of Worker Sterility in the Social Hymenoptera. In: *Advances in the Study of Behavior*, pp. 251–317. Elsevier Ltd.
- Roy-Zokan EM, Cunningham CB, Hebb LE, McKinney EC, Moore AJ (2015) Vitellogenin and vitellogenin receptor gene expression is associated with male and female parenting in a subsocial insect. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **282**, 20150787.

- Sheese BE, Voelker PM, Rothbart MK, Posner MI (2007) Parenting quality interacts with genetic variation in dopamine receptor D4 to influence temperament in early childhood. *Development and psychopathology*, **19**, 1039–46.
- Smukalla S, Caldara M, Pochet N *et al.* (2008) FLO1 Is a Variable Green Beard Gene that Drives Biofilm-like Cooperation in Budding Yeast. *Cell*, **135**, 726–737.
- Thompson RR, Walton JC (2004) Peptide effects on social behavior: effects of vasotocin and isotocin on social approach behavior in male goldfish (*Carassius auratus*). *Behavioral neuroscience*, **118**, 620–626.
- Troyer K (1984) Diet selection and digestion in Iguana iguana : the importance of age and nutrient requirements. *Oecologia*, **61**, 201–207.
- Tsang SY, Zhong S, Mei L *et al.* (2013) Social Cognitive Role of Schizophrenia Candidate Gene GABRB2. *PLoS ONE*, **8**.
- Tsoory MM, Youdim MB, Schuster R (2012) Social-cooperation differs from individual behavior in hypothalamic and striatal monoamine function: Evidence from a laboratory rat model. *Behavioural Brain Research*, **232**, 252–263.
- Tuttle EM, Bergland AO, Korody ML *et al.* (2016) Divergence and functional degradation of a sex chromosome-like supergene. *Current Biology*, **26**, 344–350.
- Wang J, Wurm Y, Nipitwattanaphon M *et al.* (2013) A Y-like social chromosome causes alternative colony organization in fire ants. *Nature*, **493**, 664–8.
- West SA, Gardner A (2013) Adaptation and Inclusive Fitness. *Current Biology*, **23**, R577–R584.
- West SA, Griffin AS, Gardner A (2007) Evolutionary Explanations for Cooperation. *Current Biology*, **17**, 661–672.
- Wittig RM, Crockford C, Deschner T *et al.* (2014) Food sharing is linked to urinary oxytocin levels and bonding in related and unrelated wild chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **281**, 20133096.
- Young LJ, Lim MM, Gingrich B, Insel TR (2001) Cellular mechanisms of social attachment. *Hormones and behavior*, **40**, 133–8.